F328E

Class 225.97Q Book

General Theological Seminary Library

CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

Purchased from the fund bequeathed to the Seminary by

EUGENE AUGUSTUS HOFFMAN, D. D.

DEAN 1879-1902

# Foreign Religious Series

Edited by

R. J. COOKE, D. D.

---

SECOND SERIES. 16MO. CLOTH. EACH 40 CENTS, NET.

---

DO WE NEED CHRIST FOR COMMUNION WITH GOD?

By Professor Ludwig Lemme, of the University of Heidelberg

---

ST. PAUL AS A THEOLOGIAN

(TWO PARTS)

By Professor Paul Feine, of the University of Vienna

---

THE NEW MESSAGE IN THE TEACHING OF JESUS

By Professor Philipp Bachmann, of the University of Erlangen

---

THE PECULIARITY OF THE RELIGION OF THE BIBLE

By Professor Conrad Von Orelli, of the University of Basle

---

OUR LORD

By Professor K. Müller, of the University of Erlangen

# TWO PARTS
# PART I

# St. Paul as a Theologian

By

PAUL FEINE

Professor in the University of Vienna

PART I

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY NEW YORK

NEW YORK: EATON & MAINS
CINCINNATI: JENNINGS & GRAHAM

225.97Q
F328E

43938

Copyright, 1908, by
EATON & MAINS.

OBERLIN THEOL. SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

# I

## St. Paul not a Systematizer, but a Theologian

The Pauline theology is not a dogmatic system which exhibits the ideal world of Christian belief as a uniform building connected and divided in itself; nor is it a philosophic system, which seeks to explain everything which exists. Neither the speculative spirit nor philosophical strength belongs to the Jewish character, and Paul is no exception.

The explanation of the world from the standpoint of Judaism is of a religious kind. It rests on the thought of God's revelation in the people of Israel. Philo, an Alexandrian Jew, a contemporary of Paul, endeavored to unite the Greek view of the world and the Jewish faith. He was unsuccessful; both concepts suffered by it. From the books of Moses no philosophic system can be derived. Likewise the effort of Melanchthon and his successors to make Paul's line of thought in the Epistle to the Romans the fundamental scheme of dogmatics did not

prove successful; for the Epistle to the Romans is not a "compendium of Christian doctrine," but a loose stringing together of certain theological lines of thoughts for the church in Rome of Paul's day. And yet it is true that the Reformation rightly considered the triad derived from the Epistle to the Romans—sin, law, grace—as the principal parts of Christian doctrine. "I cannot see," writes Melanchthon, "how I can call one a Christian who does not know it." But in this very Epistle to the Romans—according to a correct understanding of it—Paul shows that the terms sin and law only receive their Christian coining from the experience of grace. Thus the order is again disturbed; and what to us of the present appears as the center of all dogmatics, Christology, is not found at all in the Epistle to the Romans, rather do we find there only isolated Christological statements.

But those also are ignorant of the apostle's teaching who can see in the preaching of Paul no real theology but only a loose combination of thoughts on salvation. Paul studied theology in his youth when he sat at the feet of the rabbi Gamaliel in Jerusalem.

Certain doctrinal views of God, revelation, law, sin, world, history of salvation, perfection of salvation, etc., were transmitted to him; not in a systematic way as we now read them in a manual of Jewish theology, but after the manner of the rabbinic schools and according to their principles of Old Testament interpretation. Yet he received certain doctrinal teachings on which he still depended, or was influenced by, even as Christian and Apostle. His Christian theology is a new building upon the ruins of his Jewish faith; but not only upon, but also partly with its ruins. One can indeed speak of a Pauline doctrine of salvation; for the question how man obtains salvation was clearly and keenly reflected upon by Paul. In his Epistles he never propounded his lines of thought in a systematical and strictly logical manner; but by collecting the elements of his doctrine one gets before him a picture which comprises the whole history of humanity as well as of heaven and of earth.

Because of the truth of his gospel Paul was involved in violent struggles with Judaism; but for a great part they were fought

on theological ground. This was only possible with the means of education of that time, that is, in this case with the methods of rabbinic argumentation, or Judaic-Alexandrian allegory. On this account certain lines of thought, e. g., many things in the Epistle to the Galatians, appear strange to us. It is not easy for us to get through to the religious thought which lies at its foundation; and yet historical justice demands that it should be acknowledged that according to his education and past, Paul was restricted to such argumentation. One should not proudly shrug his shoulders from the point of view of the twentieth century over these out of date methods, but understand and appreciate Paul in connection with his time. We do the same with the Pythagorean symbolism of numbers and the allegorical trifles of Philo.

Paul is the greatest thinker and the greatest theologian of primitive Christianity. The lucidity and keenness of his mind made him the first to perceive Christianity as a new religion, a world religion, though he did not belong to the original apostolic circle, not even to the immediate disciples of Jesus.

Modern theology may find "dangerous casuistry" in some arguments of the Apostle, but before the force of the dialectics of this former rabbi a Peter grew dumb; seditious congregations bowed. To the Greek world of that time the arguments of Paul do not seem to have sounded too strange, for the Apostle had subjected this world to his preaching. So long as there is a Christian theology Paul will not be forgotten; for he was the first to work out a number of theological ideas; upon others he pressed the stamp of his mind and transformed them. That form of theology which he presented has been an important leaven in almost all the great minds in the history of the Christian Church. The best in Augustine's theology comes from Paul, and with full consciousness Luther received Pauline Christianity, for he saw in it the purest expression of the Gospel of Christ in general.

## II

### Conversion the Basis of Paul's Theology

The Pauline theology contains a very strong personal, individual woof. This can only be understood as the theoretical result of the conversion of the apostle. The religious experience which Paul had before Damascus radically changed many religious and theological tenets which, till then, seemed to him immovable. In his mind the world of belief had to adjust itself anew. In the theology of Paul the question is, accordingly, twofold, religious experience and its theological understanding. But, before we proceed to sketch the theology of Paul according to its characteristic features, we must describe the contents of his religious experience at his conversion. There are so many statements concerning it in his Epistles, that an idea of the effect of this experience can very easily be obtained.

Paul experienced his conversion as a new creation. Endeavoring to illustrate that

which at that time entered into his life before Damascus, he grasps at the highest comparison which he had at his command. To him the experience of his conversion was like the light which, on the morning of creation, broke forth from the darkness of eternity (2 Cor. 4. 6)—"Old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new," and Paul himself was a new creature (2 Cor. 5. 17; Gal. 6. 15). He felt the limitations of the earthly falling off from him, he knew himself transferred to the sphere of the divine life. He is now dead (Gal. 2. 19). The world is crucified unto him and he unto the world (Gal. 6. 14). He knows himself delivered from the present world which is evil (Gal. 1. 4); delivered from the realm of darkness and translated into the kingdom of the Son of God (Col. 1. 13). As existence and non-existence, as life and death, his Christian and pre-Christian periods of life separate one from the other.

This separation, the most wonderful surprise to himself, suddenly entered his life. He feels the contrast of his present life with the past so strongly that he constructs no bridge between the past and present; nay,

he excludes a time of transition from one period of life to the other. Christ apprehended him with invisible power at a time when he was least inclined to obey the Gospel, when he rather distinguished himself before his coreligionists and his pharisaical friends by fanatical zeal in persecuting the entire Christian Church (Gal. 1. 13, 14). According to its contents the apostle described his experience before Damascus as a revelation of the heavenly Christ. He saw Christ as a heavenly form, surrounded by divine splendor (2 Cor. 4. 6; comp. also Acts 9. 22, 26). It was not a phenomenon which he perceived with his outward senses only, but this revelation of Christ hath shined into his heart (2 Cor. 4. 6), and opened to him an inner understanding of the Person manifesting himself ("to reveal his Son *in me*," Gal. 1. 16). It were much too little to say that he simply understood that this Jesus so bitterly persecuted by him is, nevertheless, the Messiah. The heavenly Christ, in that hour, drew Paul into life-communion with himself. It was this experience which produced the revolution affecting his innermost part, which filled him with

new life and the immovable conviction that the power of God had become powerful in him. Henceforth he feels himself so united with this heavenly Christ that he can no more free himself from him. This Christ-life pervades him, his power fills him, his will rules him.

With this, something else was given at the same time. Paul, feeling himself apprehended and surrounded by the grace of the Messiah exalted to God, and feeling a stream of divine love flowing in his heart, acquired what had been the most ardent desire of his heart, that is, to become an heir and citizen of the Messianic kingdom and to be in harmony with God. But this came about through him whom he had persecuted in an experience which made him share not only in the highest blessedness, but at the same time also contained the severest judgment on his past life and effort. He had been in the wrong way and by persecuting the Messiah had sinned against the honor of God. And yet he was not punished because of this guilt; but in spite of it was found worthy of the sanctifying experience of the Messiah. In that hour every false

zeal was killed in him; the overpowering sense of the grace of God dawned upon him, apprehended him, the sinner in Christ. Henceforth the grace of God is to him the guiding star of all religious life.

And yet another thing became intensely alive in Paul since that hour before Damascus: the consciousness that Christ had called him into his service and made him his apostle. The self-manifestation of Christ to him did not take place in order that he, the persecutor, might simply be led in the way of truth, but that he might bear witness before the world of the glory of Christ. Thus, the whole preaching of Paul had no other purpose than to make alive in others that which he had himself experienced as the most blissful truth.

As a Christian Paul knows himself in a new existence. He is filled with new impulses and powers, is raised above the limits of the earthly; freed from the temporal; detached from the world; exempt from the power and guilt of sin. Nothing external, sensual, material, or ungodly fetters him any more. He is transferred to the new age of the Messianic time; he lives, as a child of

God, in the communion of God. He is freed from all fear; he frankly comes before God with the childlike exclamation: "Abba, Father." There may have been ever so much of eschatology, of the hope of perfection in the religious thought-world of the apostle; but the fundamental and decisive element in his consciousness was the already experienced new creation, redemption, reconciliation, justification, salvation, divine adoption. The feeling of the certainty of salvation which permeated him gave him his sublime energy, joyfulness and apostolic strength.

Paul often describes this experience of his life as the efficacy of the Holy Spirit. A transcendent power, the Spirit of God, had seized him, and revealed unto him "what eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath entered into the heart of man," yea, even the deep things of God, which the Spirit reveals unto him. In the power of the Spirit he knows that the flesh as an opposing potency is now abolished, for the Spirit is the new ruling principle of his life. Whoever follows the influence of this Spirit and is ruled by him, in him is killed that which

is sinful, and there is brought about the fulfillment of the righteousness of God. Where the Spirit is, righteousness is; where righteousness is, there also is divine life.

But this experience of the Spirit is for the apostle, on the whole, nothing else than the personal experience of Christ. Let one only read 2 Cor. 3. 5, and see how Paul traces back to the Spirit all the new which is in him as Christian. The Christian congregations are epistles written by the Spirit of the living God. But Christ wrote them by using his apostles as instruments. If the old covenant, which had the ministration of condemnation, had glory, the manifestation of the Spirit, how much more the new covenant which, as ministration of righteousness, is ministration of the Spirit! Yea, one must deny glory to the old covenant in comparison with the overpowering glory of the New Covenant. The glory on the countenance of Moses was transient; but Christ is the Spirit himself. From his shining glory, splendor for splendor, universally, comes upon the face of the Christian, and transforms him instantly, so that the nature of the Christian becomes ever more the

glory of Christ. From the face of this Christ the glory of God shines into the hearts of believers. This treasure they have in earthen vessels, in the mortal body; but in distresses, perplexities, persecutions, in the mortification of this body in the apostolic service, the power of the life of Jesus becomes powerful. If the outer man perish, the inner man is renewed day by day in this experience of Jesus, external "affliction worketh a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory," the completion of which the Christian longs for in the expectation of speedy, perfected union with Christ.

Thus, the briefest and most comprehensive expression of all his faith and life is, Christ. He calls his gospel the Gospel of Christ. In his preaching he wishes to bring in the fullness of the blessing of Christ (Rom. 15. 29). All his thoughts he brings into captivity to the obedience of Christ (2 Cor. 10. 5). He speaks not, but Christ speaks in him (2 Cor. 13. 3). As Christ lives in him (Gal. 2. 20), he desires by his preaching that this Christ shall be also formed in believers (Gal. 4. 19). He even coined formulas to express this relation of com-

munion: Christ is "in us" as the ruling power of life, or, we are "in Christ." This must be understood spatially. Christ is thought of as the sphere, the province of life, within which we should move, so that he surrounds us like the air which we breathe; or, Paul exhorts "to put on Christ," as one puts on a garment, covered by which one is protected and is well secured. In his preaching he is determined to know nothing save Jesus Christ, and him crucified (1 Cor. 2. 2). He sets him before our eyes (Gal. 3. 1). When Christ is preached, he rejoices, though he may have to find fault with the manner in which this is sometimes done (Phil. 1. 18). The apostle's entire activity, his life or his death, can only serve for the magnifying of Christ (Phil. 1. 20). "For me to live is Christ" (Phil. 1. 21). To obtain him, he forgot all former life-interests; and he knows only the desire to be apprehended by the living power of Christ (Phil. 3. 7-14). As the apostle of the Gentiles he preaches the riches of the glory of the divine mystery, that among the Gentiles also, Christ is the hope of heavenly glory (Col. 1. 27 sq.; Eph. 3. 3-12). The apos-

tle's understanding of the entire development of the world is directed to the end that Christ shall become the ruling head of the universe (Eph. 1. 10, 22 sq.; Col. 1. 17 sq.), that Christ shall be all and in all (Col. 3. 11); especially, however, that the fullness of the gifts and faculties working in the Christian Church shall become the sum total of that which Christ is (Eph. 4. 1-16).

This description of the effect of Paul's conversion would, however, be incomplete without the moral life-ideal which since then stood before the soul of the apostle, and which in great part he realized. As a Pharisee, Paul also naturally considered pharisaic-ethics as divinely ordained. That he led a sinful life in the pre-Christian period of his life, and was only freed from the chains of this life by his conversion is out of the question. What he speaks in praise of the Jews devoted to the law (Rom. 10. 2 sq.; 9. 30 sq.), that they have a zeal of God, concerns him also before he became a Christian. According to his own confession (Phil. 3. 6), he led a legally blameless life at the time of his conversion. In Rom. 7 he expresses confessions, which were only to be attained

from a Christian point of view. But in the Epistle to the Philippians he asserts in the strongest manner the contrast of his Christian and pre-Christian morality. What formerly was his pride and his glory before God, is to him loss; yea, dung. He feels in himself the fundamental difference between his new ethics and the old. And again, it is the overwhelming knowledge of Jesus Christ which has destroyed the old and makes him follow after the new ideal.

The law, the book of the revelation of God, as scribism of that time interpreted it, was the codex of the Jewish, especially Pharisaic, morality. God had laid down his law; it was for man to fulfill it. The doing of God's commandments made men righteous before God. The complete fulfilling of the law was indeed difficult, a yoke under which the pious had to groan the whole day, but it was not impossible, and what was still lacking, the merit of the fathers supplied. Hence, with all aspiration after holiness, the Pharisaic morality is outward, legal, cold, calculating. Formalism, egoism, pride, and a mania for retaliation characterize it in spite of all its correctness. All these, how-

ever, are contrasts which Paul, the apostle, praises as morality. But the law is abolished; is put aside by the death of Christ. All performance as such, like circumcision, sacrifices and ceremonies, is completely depreciated, not, however, in order to establish a new norm to which the Christian had to submit in place of the Jewish, but that the Spirit of Christ which moves and fills the Christian, regulates all moral action of man. And this Spirit of Christ is here also nothing else than the life, in this case the moral life, of Jesus itself, flowing from perfect communion with God. For the apostle the morality of the Christian grows from his life-communion with his Lord. In the consciousness of this lasting life-relation and inner unity Paul coined the maxims of his Christian ethics. All moral doing has its independent norm in the lasting and undisturbed religious communion with Christ and God—"whatsoever is not of faith is sin" (Rom. 14. 23); hence, the conscience norm which is bound in God and Christ can prohibit to the one what it permits to the other (1. Cor. 8. 7 sq.). There is no outward legal authority for the Christian. Every

truly moral action grows out of the love which has its root in God and Christ—"in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love" (Gal. 5. 6).

In his struggle against legalistic, Jewish Christianity, the apostle expressly emphasizes the truth that only the preaching of Christ, who by his power morally transforms believers, leads to the full height of Christian freedom from the law and to acceptance with God. From the descriptions of his personal and apostolic processes of life, of which we occasionally read in his Epistles, we can ascertain how he also had been morally renewed by Christ, and in following Christ we can also see how according to his judgment, his Jewish Christian opponents in spite of their opposition to his gospel, nevertheless did not experience the power of Christ in such a manner as he. Certainly the confessions of Saint Paul (2 Cor. 6 and 11) have no equal. Show us the man who can say the like of himself! In them we get a clear understanding that this apostle *was destined* to procure for the gospel a victorious career in the world at that

time. "Giving no offence in anything, that the ministry be not blamed. But in all things approving ourselves as the ministers of God, in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses, in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labors, in watchings, in fastings; by pureness, by knowledge, by longsuffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned; by the word of truth, by the power of God, by the armor of righteousness on the right hand and on the left; by honor and dishonor, by evil report and good report: as deceivers, and yet true; as unknown, and yet well known; as dying, and, behold, we live; as chastened, and not killed; as sorrowful, yet alway rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things." This is what a man could write of himself who, with ardent zeal once followed after Pharisaic righteousness. Herein we recognize the profoundest change in the apostle. But only such conduct of life and administration of office, according to the firm conviction of the apostle, was worthy of the servant of Christ.

From what has been said we must now

draw some inferences. The Person who accomplished these effects in him the apostle could not, of course, comprehend as human. The Christ, who did all this in him, was to him of divine nature. But this does not entirely disclose the meaning of the apostle. Paul rather combined this Christ with God in an inner unity. Ideas, between which he can optionally choose, are, that *God* wrought in him the miracle of the manifestation of his Son in him (Gal. 1. 16; Rom. 15. 15 sq.), or that *Jesus Christ* had revealed himself unto him (Gal. 1. 12; Rom. 1. 4 sq.; Phil. 3. 12). Paul is apostle by Jesus Christ *and* God (Gal. 1. 1). In the revelation of Christ God himself becomes efficient. The revelation of God which brings salvation leaves no remainder in the revelation of Christ, because in Christ dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily (Col. 2. 9). The gospel is the gospel of God, because it is the gospel of Christ. The apostles are servants of God (2 Cor. 6. 4) as well as of Christ (1 Cor. 3. 5; Col. 1. 7; 1 Tim. 4. 6); the Christian state is service of God as well as that of Christ (1 Thess. 4. 1 sq.; Gal. 1. 10; Rom. 14. 18; Eph. 6. 6);

a life and a bringing forth fruit for God and Christ (Gal. 2. 19; 2 Cor. 5. 15; Rom. 6. 11-13). The apostle prays to Christ as to God (1 Thess. 3. 11 sq.; 2 Cor. 12. 8 sq.; 1 Cor. 16. 22) (*maranatha, come, Lord*).

For this reason Paul on the whole traced back the experienced effects of salvation to Christ as well as to God. It is God who calls men to believe. Nevertheless Paul calls the Christians also "the called of Jesus Christ" (Rom. 1. 6; 1 Cor. 7. 22); for God has called the Christians into the grace of Christ (Gal. 1. 6; Phil. 3. 14). Thus he also says of Christ (Rom. 15. 7), as of God (Rom. 11. 15; 14. 3), that he receives men unto faith. Grace is imparted to the Christian by Christ as well as by God. Thus in the introductions to the Epistles, where almost throughout the grace of Christ only is solicited (1 Thess. 5. 28; 2 Thess. 3. 18; Gal. 6. 18; 1 Cor. 16. 23; 2 Cor. 13. 13; Rom. 16. 20; Phil. 4. 23; also 2 Cor. 8. 9; Rom. 1. 5), God beseeches by the apostles as they pray in Christ's stead that the world may accept the offered reconciliation (2 Cor. 5. 20). Like God, Christ works effects of the Almighty: he directs that the apostle

can go to his congregations (1 Thess. 3. 11; 1. Cor. 4. 19; 16. 7); he punishes and chastens in this life (1 Cor. 11. 32); can bestow health (2 Cor. 12. 8); he keeps from evil (2 Thess. 3. 3); directs the hearts (2 Thess. 3. 5); makes faithful (1 Cor. 7. 25); keeps firm and blameless unto the coming (1 Cor. 1. 8); is able to subdue all things unto himself (Phil. 3. 21).

In the Epistles to the Thessalonians are many passages of which the expositor will never be able to decide conclusively whether the question is of God or of Christ. The quotation from Isa. 45. 23: "Every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue confess to God," which in Rom. 14. 11, answering to its original meaning, is referred to God, in Phil. 2. 10 sq. is applied to Christ. According to Rom. 12. 3 sqq., we are members of *one* body in Christ, because God gives to every man gifts of grace.

In the preceding we presented the Christian experience of the apostle, and derived it wholly from his conversion. We must now justify this procedure. There are still many who wrongly assert that the Christian faith of the apostle only gradually reached

its full height; that his doctrine of justification is the product of his struggle with believing and unbelieving Judaism; and that the consciousness of his call as a missionary to the Gentiles is erroneously transferred by the apostle to the time of his conversion; that in truth from the very beginning Paul was rather a Jewish missionary like the other apostles, and was only led by the course of his activity to the mission among the Gentiles.

We do not wish to be misunderstood. Paul's theology is certainly missionary theology. Nothing was so much on the apostle's heart as that Christ should be universally preached. For this reason, as he himself stated, he became unto the Jews a Jew, unto the Greeks a Greek to gain them for Christ (1 Cor. 9. 19 sq.). He accommodated himself to circumstances. In the presence of new situations his preaching received new directions. According to Gal. 2., the inference that the Jewish Christians under certain circumstances sinned by clinging to the law, was made by Paul against Peter only after the Apostolic Council at Antioch. Many theological statements and wordings

in his Epistles are later formations. His argument in the Epistle to the Galatians against his Jewish Christian opponents, and also many things in the Epistle to the Romans, are only to be fully explained from the necessity of the critical position against Judaism. In the captivity-epistles we first find the teaching that Christ is made the Head of all which he has redeemed, also of the angelic powers. Here the cosmological importance of Christ compared with the earlier Epistles appears enlarged. Paul could only write Rom. 9—11 and Eph. 2. 3 after a Gentile Christian church had grown up beside the Jewish Christian.

Nevertheless the characteristic features of Paul's preaching and also of his theology were settled in him as soon as he had come to a deeper understanding of his experience before Damascus; for this, *outer* as well as *inner* reasons conclusively speak.

Respecting the outer reason Paul differs from Augustine, Luther and Calvin, in that he himself does not know of any development of his Christian knowledge, but treats his Christian as well as the fore-Christian period of his life throughout as one. In

some conclusive passages in which he represents his preaching of Christ as the only true preaching which answers to the true nature of Christ, and where he also has his conversion in mind (Gal. 1. 9, 10 and 2 Cor. 5. 16), the "now" is the whole time of his Christian state without any consciousness of a change. But in the Epistle to the Galatians he defends his gospel which is free from the law against Jewish Christianity. He would be spiting his own face, would himself have been a servant, had he also had a period of Jewish-Christian preaching. Where could one find an event in his Christian life which had ripened his consciousness still undeveloped in conversion to such high religious experiences as we have elicited from his Epistles, and which, according to the apostle's own spirit, stand in opposition to the Jewish Christian gospel of his opponents? Gal. 1 can only be understood in this way, that the contrarieties of "divine" and "human" in which his own and a Jewish-restricted gospel are opposed to his judgment, had already entered into his consciousness as the result of his conversion. 2 Cor. 5. 17 shows the inference with which he

introduces this verse ("therefore"), that the consciousness of being a new creature is contemporaneous with the giving up of the fleshly Christ-picture; which means, that with conversion he entered from the state of a knowledge of Christ according to the flesh into that of Christ according to the spirit.

Paul knows nothing either of the assumption that his apostleship to the heathen commenced only in the course of his missionary activity. Rather he records: "but when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that *I might preach him among the heathen;* immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood" (Gal. 1. 15, 16). One can push embarrassing facts into the corner and ignore them; one can get rid of them by a forced interpretation; one can here say that Paul was mistaken in his recollection and took later perceptions as immediate results of his conversion. But realities cannot be divested of their indwelling power. Paul expresses here clearly and distinctly the consciousness that he felt himself called not only to be an apostle but to be an apostle to the heathen, before he considered whether

he should confer with flesh and blood, or whether he should get his legitimation from the older apostles; and we must further add that the structure of the first two chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians, the retrospective view of the history of his life and missionary activity, rests upon the thought that with his conversion he at once knew himself loosened from everything human including what was Jewish, and that from the beginning he worked as an apostle among the heathen. In the struggle with Jewish Christianity he means to prove that every true Christian experience is opposed to Judaism; that from the beginning he had this knowledge and finally set it off victoriously even against Peter. Under such circumstances an error of Paul in this question is out of the question.

To all this concerning the external reasons must be added by way of confirmation the *inner* reasons. What Paul experienced in his conversion was not to be apprehended in the religious setting of Judaism. He experienced a religious and moral regeneration which destroyed his Jewish ideals. The inner change which he experienced placed

him in closest relation to him whom Judaism, especially Pharisaism, had rejected and cast off. In an overwhelming manner he learned that the question was not activity but passivity. Righteousness is not acquired, it is bestowed. The quality of man is not a ground for salvation, but God's grace. All the blessedness which came to him he received not because of his Pharisaic zeal, but in opposition to it. The cross of Christ is not the righteous judgment of God on a pseudo-Messiah, but him whom the Jews had crucified God has invested with the highest dignity, imbued with divine power, and this power Christ made efficacious in Paul.

The theologian Paul is strongly underrated if one thinks that the course of his mission first opened his eyes to the truth that salvation is also destined for the heathen. No, Paul became a heathen missionary, knew himself to be sent to the heathen, because in his conversion the religious difference between Jews and Gentiles had faded into an unreal semblance over against the contrasts of the human and the divine, of sin and grace. When speaking of

Judaism (2 Cor. 3. 4; Rom. 9. 11), Paul describes his personal experience in conversion. In sinful conceit against God, Judaism pursues the way of its own righteousness; the spirit of stupefaction rests on it; they have eyes, but see not; ears, but they hear not; a veil is on their heart when they read the Old Testament as the testimony for the divinity of their religion. Christ is the end of the law. The ministration of the Old Testament is the ministration of the letter, of condemnation, of death; that of the New Covenant is ministration of the Spirit, of righteousness, of life. Not only is sinful heathenism lost and damned, but Judaism also which sees not the light of the glorious gospel of Christ who is the image of God. On the other hand, every one is saved who calls upon Christ as Lord who died and rose again.

In like manner the contrast of flesh and spirit in Paul's sometimes almost dualistic keenness, is only rightly explained from the manner of the apostle's Christian experience before Damascus, since by that he felt himself lifted into a new sphere of existence, which he understood as in opposition to the

earthly. With this personal experience some theological lines of thought were afterward connected, thus that of Gal. 4, according to which Judaism also belongs to the category of the cosmic and that the old covenant was carnal, or that concerning the death of Christ as God's judgment, in which all flesh —Jews and Gentiles—shall receive the sentence of condemnation from God (Rom. 8. 3).

## III

## Main Elements of Pauline Theology

### God

The apostle's conception of God is in the main the same as that of contemporary Judaism. It is religious belief, not philosophic speculation, and it rests on the consciousness of possessing the revelation of God. On this account also the problems of world-view do not disturb this conception of God, for they find in part an answer already given in the contents of religious belief itself, like such questions as to origin of the world; or they are either not felt at all or only imperfectly so, like the problem of the origin of evil, or the antinomy of the freedom of man and his dependence on God.

God's Almighty Will created the world and rules in it continually. Nature follows not its own laws which God imposed upon it, but in every event God is immediately efficient. Jewish contemplation of the world had also the feeling of a regulated course in nature; and it also held as self-evident that

God can interfere with it at any moment and often does so in extraordinary events, in signs and miracles. In the hand of God lies the beginning, as well as the progress and the end. The bringing about of this end of the world by God, by means of his omnipotence, was one of the familiar views of the Judaism of that time, which Paul also shared.

Like nature, man also is unconditionally subject to the will and guidance of God. He rules the individual as well as nature and the whole history of humanity with irresistible power in order to realize his purpose. Man came forth faultlessly from the creative hand of God; the order of nature was also good. When sin entered the world through Adam—in answer to the question how this was possible with God's all-powerful will, only statements are given—God's sentence inflicted death on humanity and subjected also the whole creation because of the sin of man to vanity. Under this divine judgment the whole creation groans, especially man, but he must bow to it. Every man is in the hand of God as clay in the hand of the potter. God can make man a vessel of honor

and a vessel of dishonor; no man can oppose him, as little as the clay can say to the potter: why hast thou made me thus? God knows indeed very well that the condition of the world is a stranger to his will. But the question why he does not restore the normal condition by his all-powerful will, is no problem for Judaism. That God does not stop sin, shows that God designs certain ways for humanity and it means to understand these ways. Judaism is convinced that humanity and nature, which both have their origin in God, will certainly accomplish their end and will be brought back by God to a union with him; for God's strong arm will in its own time destroy all that is opposed to God and bring about paradisaical conditions.

But if such is the relation of the created world and of man to the Creator, men are weak instruments of his mighty power and have no independence over against the accomplishment of his ends. The course of the world, then, must not be judged according to the category of cause and effect, but of the purpose which God has appointed. The contemplation of the world and its history by

Judaism and Paul is teleologico-theistic. The transcendent will of God appoints the course of the world; an inflexible course has been fixed by God. There is no room for the freedom of man,[1] for the thought of a development resulting from the sum of individual wills. God, and not man, has constructed this world-picture. Anthropology recedes behind theism. Man has the task to look at the facts in history and nature which God puts forward to manifest his will.

Since God's will is immutable and is fixed from eternity, the whole course of the world is foreseen and predetermined. It is a firm Jewish maxim that that which is last in the execution is first in the intention; for this reason everything which happens is from eternity clear before God's eyes, and he manifested in typical manner certain historical phenomena at which his will aims. But the perfect knowledge is only possible to man when he looks back from the end to

---

[1] The author can hardly be understood here as denying personal human freedom, since, as he knows, Paul, referring to his conversion, declares he "*was not disobedient to* the heavenly vision," which he could not be were he not free, but as denying the fact that combined humanity in any generation or period can thwart the purposes of God.—Editor.

the beginning and from the success discloses the intention of God.

It is impossible to have an historical understanding of the history of the apostle unless one takes into account these premises self-evident for the apostle. Many things which we of the present day find strange in Paul, because we no more think a pure teleological theism, but acknowledge the law of causality in the explanation of the world, have their origin in these premises.

This scheme of world-contemplation filled Paul since he had become a Christian with partially new contents. The decisive change was this: that Paul perceived the cross of Christ which to him, as to Judaism in general, was the greatest offence, as a divine act for the salvation of the world. As a Jew he considered the law as the perfect revelation of God, given as the way of righteousness, a guide to life. But now the death of Christ shows him that this dying of the Messiah was necessary for salvation; for nothing took place without God's will and intention. Had God delivered the Messiah unto death, salvation was not possible without this death. Then Israel also, from

whom Messiah came, was declared sinful before God, entire humanity was guilty before God. There was nothing in the claim of Judaism to special holiness acquired by observing the law. Rather had the law executed its judgment on the Messiah; but in the Messiah, the representative head of the people, the people were altogether declared guilty of such death.

We shall now understand the lines of thought of the apostle, objectionable not only to the Judaism of that time but which also may be to us, according to which God gave the law, not for the sake of leading the people of Israel to fulfill the will of God, but because of transgressions (Gal. 3. 19), that is, to call forth transgressions or to increase sin (Rom. 5. 20), that the law is mediator, a codicil to the testament of divine promise (Gal. 3. 17); a cruel schoolmaster which enslaved humanity till Christ came and loosened the bonds (Gal. 3. 24, 25); for in these sentences the experience of the abolition of the law as a principle of salvation which Paul had made in his conversion, is inserted into his teleological-theistic contemplation of the world. The

thought of the gradual education of the human race by a gradual revelation of God and the understanding of the law as such educational means in the hands of God, was entirely remote from the apostle. But God must certainly have had some purpose with the law. As soon as Paul saw from his Christian point of view that Christ died under the curse of the law (Gal. 3. 13; Deut. 21. 23); as soon as he perceived that the natural man not having the Spirit, could not fulfill the law, the law turned into the opposite of that which it was to him before. He inferred that it served in the hand of God to increase sin, that grace might the more abound.

We now understand also what Paul says of the work of God—especially in the first chapters of the Epistle to the Romans. The doctrine of the wrath of God as the righteousness of God punishing sin, is current in Judaism; but it is new that the apostle thinks of Judaism as being under the wrath of God like the rest of the human race. This statement also Judaism cannot understand. To put Israel's moral status on a par with that of heathenism—in spite of all self-

accusations of lacking righteousness which the fourth book of Ezra contains—appeared to the Jews as blasphemous. But one must only free himself from the traditional conception of the Epistle to the Romans and rightly understand it. In the first chapters Paul did not intend to make a statement of the moral condition of the whole human race and lead it to repentance and prepare it for the acceptance of the gospel. The Epistle to the Romans was written to a congregation which was already Christian and to this, not to the extra-Christian world, Paul wishes to say something in chapters 1 and 3. The apostle would show how the history of the pre-Christian human race presented itself to the view of the Christian spectator. The description of the sinful heathen world (chapter 1) and of sinful Judaism (chapter 2) is sketched from the point of view of the Christian consciousness and is eclipsed by the light of the gospel, by the power of God and righteousness of God given to men. Out of the Christian consciousness grew also the parallel of the two types of humanity, Adam and Christ, a contrast which we also find traces of in Jewish writings. Adam

and Christ are the two heads in the history of humanity; by the one sin and death entered the human race; by the other righteousness and life. The one brought a curse on the human race, the other a blessing. But curse and blessing are effects of God. In the second head of the human race God abolished the doom which he had ordained in consequence of the first head.

But it is not to be mistaken on which side of the divine working the center of gravity lies for the apostle. "For, if by one man's offence death reigned by one; *much more* they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ" (Rom. 5. 17). God's judicial righteousness is an inalienable element of the Pauline view of God. That God is the Judge of the world is, for the apostle, plainly a maxim (Rom. 3. 6; 2. 5, 6). He speaks of such "as are saved" and of such "as are lost." He knows that "the world is condemned" (1 Cor. 11. 32), and that all enemies of God are to be destroyed (1 Cor. 15. 24-26). The giving of Christ unto death is an act of judicial righteousness (Rom. 3. 25); but this deed is saving rather

than condemning, rather a proof of divine love than of divine justice; and in spite of the thought of judgment, the act of redemption embraces *all* men (Rom. 5. 18; 8. 32; 1 Tim. 2. 4).

The apostle thinks in the first place of Christ's surrender to expiatory death for the human race when he speaks of the proof of divine love: "For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor heights, nor depths, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. 8. 38 sq.). Since this love of God is a kindness bestowed upon the sinful race, Paul calls it grace. This is the most frequent designation in the Pauline Epistles of the work of God in men. In Christ the grace of God becomes exceeding abundant and enters upon a royal rule in the world. The grace of God is applied to men, apprehends and rules them; is the supporting foundation of all salvation. Hence the apostle's habit of commencing and closing his Epistles with the desire that God's or Christ's grace may be with the readers.

This love and grace has been personified in the person of Christ and was given to man through Christ. God spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all (Rom. 8. 32). What the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God accomplished by sending and giving of his own Son in the death of flesh. To the apostle God is the Father of his Lord Jesus Christ, and through his mediation is also the Father of Christians. On this account he coins again some formulas for the designation of this Christian knowledge of God: "God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," or, "God and the Father," that is, God, who is God and Father of Christ. Thus he also speaks of "God, the Father," or, merely the "Father," and includes therewith the mediation of this relation through Christ.

In the Old Testament already the name of the Father is frequently used to designate the relation of God to his people, and in later Jewish times this notion is also transferred to the individual relation of the individual Jew to God. But Paul sees the main roots of this designation of God in the unique Son-

ship of Jesus, of which Paul knew from the evangelic teaching, and in the salvation-experience of the Son of God who died and rose again and had drawn him into his communion. The divine adoption is to him a designation of the new life-relation to God, into which the believer feels himself placed through the atonement and redemption of Christ and which still awaits the consummation.

From the experience that God in Christ is gracious to the human race, we must also understand the apostle's thought concerning predestination and the final destiny of human history. A real doctrine of Paul on these questions, however, cannot well be presented. Paul knows nothing of a predestination of one for eternal salvation and of the other for eternal damnation. Such a conception belongs to times and persons which produced a "doctrine," and consequently endeavored to repair the gaps of Paul's idea of God, and did not perceive that Rom. 9 contained only the remains of a still Pharisaic belief in God. But they achieved no great success and at any rate did not understand the apostle.

Paul himself knows only of an eternal predestination for salvation (Eph. 1. 4; Rom. 8. 28-30). His severe declarations on God's condemnation of Esau (Rom. 9. 13); on God's arbitrariness, on whom he will have mercy and whom he will harden (Rom. 9. 14-18); of God's intention to show his wrath and to make known his power (Rom. 9. 22), these treat of God's manifestations in the course of the history of salvation, and have no reference to eternal decrees. For the entire discussion (Rom. 9. 11) is according to Rom. 9. 3, 4, entirely intended to prove that God's promises to Israel have not fallen to the ground but will be accomplished. The way which the history of salvation has taken leads indeed through a selection of some and a part of Israel, through guilt and rejection of the people, to the glorious gospel, that ungodliness be turned away from Jacob, that sin be taken away from the people (Rom. 11. 26, 27). To the Gentiles salvation is offered because Israel had grown stubborn for the time being and will not submit to the preaching of righteousness (Rom. 9. 30 sq.; 10. 2 sqq.). How little this agrees with the idea of the

unwilling subjection of man to God's determination as developed in the ninth chapter, the apostle does not show.

Finally, "all Israel shall be saved" (Rom. 11. 26). Then the whole human race shall be embraced by the grace of God. What at the end of history becomes of those who in the course of the history of salvation will make instruments of divine wrath or remained unbelieving, the apostle does not reveal; this gap also remains open. But temporary rejection does not necessarily include everlasting condemnation. The close of the eleventh chapter forbids us to understand this historical rejection in the sense of the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination. For "God hath concluded them *all* in unbelief that he might have mercy upon all" (Rom. 11. 32).

Thinking of this highest proof of God's mercy, the apostle breaks out in praise of God, which represents the climax of the Pauline belief in God: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how immeasurable are his judgments and his ways are past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord?

Or who hath been his counselor? Or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever, Amen" (Rom. 11. 33-36).

### CHRISTOLOGY

God is everything; man is nothing. This is the pith of the religion of the apostle. One can, accordingly, call his religious thinking theoretic; and yet, the singular godliness of Paul is not correctly qualified. We have already seen that not God but Christ stands in the center of his faith. His religion is Christocentric. This contradiction is removed by the fact that in Christ Paul bases full religious experience of God. In Christ dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily (Col. 2. 9); Christ is the image of the invisible God (Col. 1. 15; 2 Cor. 4. 4). Christ's work of salvation is God's work of salvation. Christ's power is God's power. The full knowledge of the nature of God and of his ways with the human race is obtained in Christ.

What is the concrete picture of Christ

which lived in the mind of Paul? The heavenly Christ, highly exalted, mighty in the power of God, rules the Christian thought of the apostle. This Christ is presented by the apostle as a divine being, whose manifestation like that of God is itself brightness, heavenly glory. God gave to this Christ the royal government over his own by means of which Christ makes effective the redemption and reconciliation brought about by him, as well as his own heavenly life with its powers. Paul accordingly ascribes to Christ almighty effects; and these go beyond the Christian Church. Christ is put as Lord over all powers. God put him, whom he raised from the dead, at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion—by this, different categories of angelic powers are meant—and above every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come (Eph. 1. 20, 21); that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, not only of all inhabitants in earth, but also of things in heaven and things under the earth (Phil. 2. 10, 11). Christ, the firstborn from the dead, is to

have the preëminence in all things (Col. 1. 18); is to become the head in which all things which are in heaven and which are on earth are to be gathered together (Eph. 1. 10), only with the qualification that, since it is God who has given him this dignity, he shall surrender his dominion to God after having subdued all enemies (1 Cor. 15. 27, 28), that God may then be all in all (1 Cor. 15. 28; Eph. 4. 6; Rom. 11. 36).

Christ obtained this high dignity for two reasons. From the very beginning he already stood to God in the relation of Son, and therefore surpassed all created things. From this blessed life of fellowship with God in the heavenly world he stepped forth for the time being to bring about the work of reconciliation and redemption which God's counsel had appointed. Because of this, and after its accomplishment, God made him ruler and head of the universe. The high dignity which Christ already had in his preëxistence shows itself in this, that God made him take part in the creation of the world. The statements of Paul on this point are, however, not clearly definite.

In 1 Cor. 8. 6 the apostle says: "We

(Christians) have *one* God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and *one* Lord, Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." The nearest understanding of the passage is, as God is the primal ground and goal of all things, so is Christ the mediator by whom the universe, including man, was called into existence. But this statement could not fully express the meaning of the passage; for Paul speaks as a Christian for whom God is the world-goal ("we in him"), and who through Christ knows himself as made such ("we by him"). The two statements "we in him" and "we by him" correspond. The first is accomplished in the second; and for this reason, in the face of the preposition "by" in both members of the statement concerning Christ, the first member of this statement stands in closest relation to redemption. Moreover, when Paul means to speak of Christ's cosmic significance the thought involuntarily reverts to the saving significance of Christ.

This is still more the case with the second passage (Col. 1. 15-20), the meaning of which may first of all be given as this, that

the universal significance of Christ is to be proven within the created world. Christ is the firstborn of all creatures; by him every thing is created which exists in heaven and in earth, the visible and the invisible; and angelic powers, which Paul calls thrones, dominions, principalities, powers (verse 16).

In what sense the "by him were all things created," is to be understood, is not clear. It is possible that the apostle himself gives the meaning in the words: "All things were created by him and for him" (verse 16); "By Christ were all things created" denotes then: He is the cause and aim of creation. Many understand this in the sense of "first cause" and "final aim," and by this predicates are transferred to Christ which, according to Pauline teaching, belong only to God. But it is overlooked that the whole statement from verse 15 on is grammatically dependent on verses 13, 14; in verse 13 sq., however, God is called the preparer of our redemption in the kingdom of his dear Son. It must also not be forgotten that the whole long construction runs again with verse 19 into a statement whose subject is God and whose contents are again the reconciliation

of the whole world through Christ. Paul is therefore far away from enlarging the position of Christ at the expense of that of God; the idea is rather this, that Christ is the Creator of all things appointed by God, but also he by whom the world is to be led back in the work of redemption and reconciliation. To the creation by Christ no doubt verse 17 refers also: "And he is before all things, and by him all things consist"; and yet this statement is also ruled by the thought of redemption, for the clause "and by him all things consist" is qualified by the other, "and he is the head of the body, the church." Hence appears the proper meaning of the whole passage, verse 15 sqq.; which is not the general or universal significance of Christ within the cosmos, but rather that Christ, the creator and bearer of all things, is also the redeemer of the universe. Already verses 12 and 13 treat of the redemption as God's work through Christ. Redemption is the principal thought of verse 14, and the Christological statement (verse 15 sq.) turns in again and again into the point of view of redemption. On this account the statements referring to the crea-

tion become somewhat vague, because a transition is made from the creation to the goal appointed for the world, or it treats of Christ as the Creator, not with reference to the beginning of the world, but to the world in its present existence.

It follows, therefore, that more important than the idea of preëxistence of Christ Paul considered that of his heavenly power and the execution of his divine purpose of salvation. With this the thought of preëxistence in the apostle is not to be depreciated; it certainly has a definite significance within the Christology of Paul. There is nothing gained for Paul by making a distinction between a real and an ideal preëxistence. Paul thinks of Christ as preëxistent in a real sense; the Creator of the world can only be a real being. True 1 Cor. 10. 4: "All [Israelites in the wilderness] did drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ." The notion of preëxistence occurs in the softened form of the Jewish-Alexandrian typology and rabbinic tradition. But in another place the apostle says that God sent his Son—from heaven (Rom.

8. 3; Gal. 4. 4); that Jesus Christ became poor for our sakes (2 Cor. 8. 9); that he left the existence in the form of God, which, however, does not yet include perfect equality with God,[1] and made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, in order to obediently fulfill the will of God (Phil. 2. 6 sqq.). This is real preëxistence.

One finds a reference to the supernatural birth in Gal. 4. 4. But "made of a woman," without mentioning the generator, is no allusion to Isa. 7. 14; it means, according to Jewish mode of expression, nothing else than entrance into humanity (comp. Job 14. 1) ("Man, that is born of woman"; Job 15. 24; 25. 4). In a peculiar manner Rom. 8. 3 treats of Jesus's entrance into the human race: "God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh." However, the perfect humanity of Jesus is by no means to be denied—this is irrefragably established for the apostle. He means to say that the sinful

[1] And yet the Apostle declares that it was from this equality Christ lowered himself to the state of a servant. "Who being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God." Phil. 2. 6ff. See Knowling, Testimony of Saint Paul to Christ, p 118.—Editor.

flesh of humanity is the model after which the flesh of Christ was also fashioned. Christ too would have been subject to sin had not another power, that of the Spirit, ruled in him. But with Paul the thought is excluded that the earthly Christ could possibly have been sinful. In a passage which represents a climax of his theological statements concerning the power of salvation (2 Cor. 5. 21) he states expressly that Christ knew no sin. After all, Rom. 8. 3 must necessarily be supplemented; this is offered by Rom. 1. 3, and 4, according to which Christ led a prior existence as Son of God. On earth he became David's descendant "according to the flesh," that is, according to his earthly birth; this, however, is only the one side of his earthly existence. The other is an existence according to the Spirit of holiness, that is, of the Holy Spirit. If this Holy Spirit is to be thought of as the power of his life in the flesh, then Christ is demonstrated to be Son of God, with power, after the resurrection from the dead, by reason of the Spirit now unimpeded by the bounds of the flesh. Here an inference may be drawn in which Paul would have seen the power of

the prior existence of Christ, had he given it consideration. It can be no other than that of the Spirit which determined the earthly and post-earthly existence of Christ. The effort toward an understanding of Christ as an undivided person in different forms of existence admits of no other decision. To this also the Christological statements in 1 Cor. 10. 4; 8. 6; Phil. 2. 6, "in the form of God" and Col. 1. 15 sqq. point.

Such questions, however, which come before the modern consciousness, as how the incarnation of the Son of God, how the mutual relation of the human and the divine in Christ is to be thought of, whether Jesus had also a human soul and human consciousness, how the relation of the sinful flesh to the divine spirit in Christ is to be thought of, etc., the apostle does not seem to have considered. Even the later ecclesiastical Christology has no satisfactory answer. In the mind of the apostle the historical reality of the person of Christ combined the two seemingly disjointing parts. He knows a Christ who was man and also of divine nature. Ancient thinking was more naive than ours. Psychological questions of this Christology

Paul did not investigate. But we should not forget that, even with the help of all modern psychology, we shall not succeed in lifting the veil of the divine mystery which once for all surrounds the person of our Lord and his entrance into the world.

Paul puts Christ as a member of humanity parallel to Adam (Rom. 5. 12 sq.). As Adam is the head, a representative and type of humanity, so also is Christ, only that Christ is superior and in him God's ways with humanity are fulfilled. It would have been easy for the apostle to assert in his Christology the Jewish-Hellenistic ideas of the heavenly man as the type after which the earthly man was created, or the self-designation of Jesus as Son of man. There are traces proving that these notions were not foreign to the apostle; but he allowed them no special influence upon his theological thinking. In the parallel between Adam and Christ (Rom. 5. 12 sq.) we find no reference to them at all, and 1 Cor. 15. 27 he quotes indeed Psalms 8. 7, according to which God has put all things under the "Son of man"; but the term "Son of man" we vainly seek by him. And if 1 Cor.

15. 47 sq. reference is indeed made to the doctrine of Philo of the archetypal man as the type of the created man—which in Philo is not at all connected with the Messianic idea—it has been reversed by the apostle and turned to the effect that the heavenly man is called the second, and not the first man. Only by the resurrection, according to this passage, did Christ become the second Adam. But if one wishes to grasp at ancient, Oriental notions in explanation of the Pauline heavenly man, he certainly loses firm ground from under his feet, judging at least from efforts hitherto made. At any rate the occasional and only solitary mention of the "heavenly man" in the Epistles of the apostle shows that other Christological ideas were more important to him; it may therefore be considered as a sign of sound judgment when in critical theology the effort is made again and again to construct from this point the Pauline Christology.

This brings us to the question as to the divinity of Christ. Paul never called Christ "God." In three passages one may think such designation is found (2 Thess. 1. 12; Titus 2. 13, and Rom. 9. 5); but in the first

two Christ is not spoken of as "our God and the Lord Jesus Christ" and "the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ," but God and Christ are put side by side; and in Rom. 9. 5 the contrast between the two statements bordering on each other, "of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came" and "who is over all, God blessed for ever, Amen," is much too strong, that both could be referred to the person of Christ; add to this that Christ would be called God over all, which in Eph. 4. 6 is reserved to God alone. The doxology (Rom. 9. 5), like the other doxologies in the Pauline Epistles, refers to God.

Our exegetical understanding of these passages finds its support in this, that Paul in an unmistakable manner subordinates Christ to God. This is contained in the designation of Christ as "Son of God" in the gradations "all are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's" (1 Cor. 3. 23); "the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God" (1 Cor. 11. 3); also, in the mediating part of Christ in the creation and redemption. In both Christ acts not independently but by order of God; and

Paul closes (1 Cor. 15. 28) the description of the Messianic power of Christ which subdues all enemies expressly by this, that Christ is subject to him who has put all things under him, that God may be all in all. The monotheism of Paul is accordingly established as according to 1 Cor. 8. 6; 12. 6; Rom. 11. 36; Eph. 4. 6.

But, on the other hand, the fact equally remains true that, according to the Paul view, Christ is of divine nature; "for he is the image of God and in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily" (Col. 2. 9). As Son he is of like essence with the Father; as Creator of the world and ruler of the world (Col. 1. 17) he possesses divine omnipotence. In his prior existence he was with God not in human but in divine form (Phil. 2. 6). The universal efficiency of his work of redemption and reconciliation rests on his dignity surpassing the whole creation. After finishing this work God gave him the dominion over all powers in earth, in heaven and under the earth. The appropriation of this redemption operates through him in such divine power, and working to a definite end, that he penetrates

the universe with his power. Hence Christ belongs, according to Paul, not on the side of humanity. He is God. But, on the other hand, the problems which open to us are not considered how we have to think in detail of Christ's origin from God, of the relation of the work of Christ beside that of God.

WARNING: DO NOT PHOTOCOPY

# Foreign Religious Series

Edited by

R. J. COOKE, D. D.

---

SECOND SERIES. 16MO. CLOTH. EACH 40 CENTS, NET.

---

## DO WE NEED CHRIST FOR COMMUNION WITH GOD?

By Professor Ludwig Lemme, of the University of Heidelberg

---

## ST. PAUL AS A THEOLOGIAN

(TWO PARTS)

By Professor Paul Feine, of the University of Vienna

---

## THE NEW MESSAGE IN THE TEACHING OF JESUS

By Professor Philipp Bachmann, of the University of Erlangen

---

## THE PECULIARITY OF THE RELIGION OF THE BIBLE

By Professor Conrad Von Orelli, of the University of Basle

---

## OUR LORD

By Professor K. Müller, of the University of Erlangen

# TWO PARTS
# PART II

# St. Paul as a Theologian

By

PAUL FEINE

Professor in the University of Vienna

PART II

NEW YORK: EATON & MAINS
CINCINNATI: JENNINGS & GRAHAM

43739

225.97Q
F
v.2

Copyright, 1908, by
EATON & MAINS.

# PART SECOND

## The Origin of the Pauline Christology

### I

### The "religious-historical" understanding of the Pauline Christology

The question as to the origin of the Pauline Christ-picture is of recent date. We owe it to F. Christian Baur and the so-called Tübingen school. Following the points of view which Baur asserted, Holsten has endeavored above all to show how Paul arrived at his theology. He understands the entire theological ideal world of Paul, including his Christology, as the result of a process which logically effectuated itself in the mind of Paul. The fact of Jesus's death on the cross and his understanding of it as a revelation of the divine purpose of salvation, effected a gradual inner transformation of the elements of his Jewish conception of the world which was opposed to the idea of the world demanded by his Christian consciousness. Holsten rejects every supernatural factor in this transformation. He knows only im-

manent, psychological events. The appearance of Christ before Damascus was no real objective manifestation, but mainly an inner illumination which showed to Paul that Jesus whom he persecuted was no pseudo-Messiah. But since he was convinced that in this subjective vision he had seen the living Christ as a heavenly being surrounded by the brightness of God, he conceived of Christ in accordance with the Jewish-Alexandrian notion of his time, as a heavenly man who was the image of God and of divine nature.

In this attempt of Holsten's to explain Paul's conception of Christ there lies a very important idea which theological science must never lose sight of if it would understand Paul historically; and he is here distinctly treated as a theological thinker. Holsten was earnestly bent on proving how everything had to change in the mind of Paul after he conceived Christ's death on the cross as a divine act of salvation, but his explanation of the change in Paul can never satisfy. Certain it is that psychological points of contact for the understanding of Christ as Messiah already existed in Paul, the Pharisee. It contradicts all probability

that the Christ-vision was a product of the mind of Paul. One is not even required to emphasize that in this case Paul would have been completely mistaken concerning the experience of his conversion. As little as the apostle speaks of it, the elements of the Christian faith had at that time already struggled with his Jewish faith, and the verdict must be that the very law of cause and effect which Holsten invokes fails in his hypothesis.

According to our proof in section 2, the question in the conversion of Paul is, in the main, not the logical understanding of a truth but a new creation, a religious and moral innovation. An episode in his life, which radically transformed the contents of his thought and volition; an elementary experience for whose description Paul catches at the highest comparison possible, this his mind did not produce. The consciousness of obligation to serve Christ with body and life, with all his thoughts and powers, with giving up his own *ego,* did not spring from a logical process. The moral ideal of life which he henceforth followed instead of the Pharisaical, as well as his apostolic calling,

cannot be intelligently comprehended as the result of his deductions from the Messiahship of Jesus.

Scientific theology has not fully consented to this part of Holsten's theory. In recent times, however, it celebrates a surprising resurrection by emphasizing that part which Holsten already found necessary in order to explain the grandeur and divinity of the Pauline picture of the Christ. Religious historical inquiry of our days connects with the idea of the heavenly man of Paul's day, and from that point seeks to solve the problem.

The mystery of New Testament Christology is said to be, that predicates are transferred to Jesus which were given to the conception of the Christ of that time in general. Derived from the Orient, as we know from Jewish apocalypses, there lived in the Judaism of that period the picture of a heavenly Christ who was expected as divine revealer, as heavenly King. Later, Judaism, in opposition to Christianity, has indeed given up the most of this and opposed it vehemently. But for the understanding of the New Testament, we must accept this belief as then living; for when Jesus appeared in his super-

human grandeur and was known as Christ, his disciples asserted of him the greatest things Judaism could affirm. These foreign religious motives must have crowded into the congregation immediately after the death of Jesus. Minds which were longing for the presence of God needed a Son of God who came down from heaven, and transferred to Jesus the ideals of their heart.

Such ideas have been especially and recently transferred to the Pauline Christology. This problem must indeed be reckoned with when one thinks that it contains essentially new elements in comparison with primitive Christian and synoptic Christology.

To the question: How did the Pauline Christology originate? the present "religious-historical" answer reads: This Christ-picture did not originate from the impression of the personality of Jesus. Pauline theology did not determine the life-work nor the biographical portrait of Jesus. This fact cannot be shaken even if Paul had known Jesus intimately, or whether he may have said this or that of Jesus in his missionary preaching. He, whose servant and disciple he wished to be, was, critically speaking, not the historical

man Jesus at all, but another. The Pauline Christ becomes intelligible only when one supposes that Paul the Pharisee had already a sum of ready ideas concerning a divine Christ which were afterward transferred to the historical Jesus. In the moment of conversion when he imagined he beheld Jesus in a vision in the bright glory of his resurrection-life he identified him with his Christ, and without further ceremony transferred to Jesus all the ideas which he already had of the heavenly being; that he already existed before the world and took part in its creation. Paul was the first who took the decisive step for the new formation and expansion of Christology. Intimate disciples of Jesus could not so easily believe that the Man who ate with them at Capernaum, or rode with them on the Galilean Sea, was the Creator of the world; but for Paul, who knew not Jesus, this difficulty did not exist. He could transfer to Christ such lofty predicates; but the thought that a divine being left heaven, went about in human form and died in order to ascend again into heaven, was, according to its nature, a mythological conception.

This hypothesis, too, starts from the supposition that transcendent influences must be excluded for the origin of the Pauline Christ-picture. Precisely similar, as in the case of Holsten, is the following line of thought: What Paul experienced before Damascus was a vision, and visions are events in the human mind and products of the human mind, though the visionary may think otherwise. This event may have had its sufficient causes equally with the visions of those who saw Savonarola alive after his death. Though we can no more accurately point out the causes, they must have been based on the personal character of Paul, on impressions and commotions of his soul. Herein, also, Holsten is the leader of the supposition that the conversion of Paul as to its nature, is to be looked upon as a change of *conviction*.

To this hypothesis applies the very same thing which we have just asserted against Holsten; but more strongly than in his case, the law of cause and effect is here also violated, since the Christ-picture of the apostle is said to have been already in his mind before his conversion, and directly

after his conversion transferred to Jesus, whereas Holsten inserts this identification in the course of the process of thoughts which followed the conversion. In that case the question can be still less, as in the case of Holsten, of a real explanation of the sudden change in the life of Paul and of a new formation which touched the depths of his being and thinking; for in such case Paul would already have had all the elements of the new life in himself, as parts of a theory familiar to him. And where, in the history of the world, did a vision ever have a like effect as with Paul? Before Damascus Paul became a servant of Christ, he became such a mighty preacher of the gospel that the Græco-Roman world could not resist his message. Can one really put the "vision" of this man on a par with the visions of those who imagined they saw Savonarola after his death?

But following this theory: How could Paul combine the life-picture of a simple man with that of the heavenly King? Must not the simplest veracity have induced him to ask whether this man was entitled to it? How could the happiness of the apostle have

followed from such a combination that he now could consider himself as having really sensibly entered into a world which till then he had merely hoped for? Furthermore: We find indeed in the writings of contemporary Judaism, in the allegories of the book of Enoch, in the apocalypses of Ezra and Baruch, in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, descriptions of a heavenly Messiah-King, but each of these apocalyptic pictures is different. The Messianic dogmatics of the Judaism of that time has something very iridescent, contradictory, changeable, whereas the Christ-picture of Paul has certain firmly outlined characteristics and does not coincide with any of the Jewish Messiah-pictures known to us. Where shall we look for the original which served as a model for the Pauline Christ? It lies in the dark, and I think it will stay there.

But we are told the demeanor of the apostle toward the preaching of Christ of the primitive church was directly startling. The older apostles would have had a true Christ-picture, whereas that of Paul was an apocalyptic, a mind-picture; and yet Paul had the boldness to oppose the Judæo-Christian

preaching; to curse everyone, even an angel from heaven, who preached another gospel than he preached. Could he express his conviction that in the main there exists no essential difference between the primitive apostolic preaching and his? Could he go to Jerusalem, to the apostolic council, in the hope of receiving the approbation of his gospel from the primitive church? And could he have really obtained it? Would he not have been blamed there for decking the historical Jesus with unhistorical claims to majesty, dignity and divinity?

No, in this way the Pauline Christology can scientifically never be made intelligible. Paul in the struggle with Jewish Christianity came out victorious when his preaching of Christ conquered the world of that time. If almost all epoch-making men in the history of the Christian church received decisive impulses from the apostle Paul, the assumption lies near, that the Pauline preaching contains the most inalienable truths of our religion, and the preaching of Christ, its kernel, is not false. The Pauline word: "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ," that is,

the historical Jesus, and this applies also to the apostle himself.

Finally, it may also be affirmed that Paul himself forbids entering upon the suggested "religious-historical" way of explaining his Christology. He once expressed himself concerning the Messianic ideas which he had before his conversion: "Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more" (2 Cor. 5. 16); Christ is here used appellatively in the meaning "the Messiah" (as Rom. 10. 6, 7; Gal. 2. 17); and the present which the apostle opposes to the past, means here, as in the parallel passage (Gal. 1. 10), the entire period of his Christian state. This follows from the reference of the "henceforth" to the mention of the death of Christ, verses 14, 15. The purpose intended by this death, as verse 15 describes it, comes about according to the apostle's judgment as soon as Christ's death shows its effect on a man. Since his conversion the apostle considers no man of any importance whose merit lies in the fleshly sphere. Even the Christ-picture which he formerly had and which, retro-

specting, he now perceives is fleshly, he laid aside. What he understands by "fleshly" follows from the contrast of the new creature which is given in the following verse, 17: "therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." We have here also the known contrast of the Pauline theology, flesh and Spirit; and there is no reason to deduct anything in this one passage from the almost dualistic keenness in which these two ideas stand against each other. As Paul otherwise also reckons Judaism under the category of flesh and declares it to be overcome and destroyed by Christianity as the religion of the Spirit, so he judges of his ideas of the Messiah which he formerly held, whether they were really more apocalyptical or Pharisaically separistic.

## II

## Elements of the Pauline Christology

In the rejected explanation of the Pauline Christology we nevertheless find an entirely correct idea: that is the reference to the contemporaneous conditionality of the Pauline Christ-picture. As a matter of course, Paul could only make Christ intelligible to himself by the aid of ideas current in his time. He was a Hellenistic Jew of the first Christian century, and he did not deny this in his Christological thoughts. Hence we find with him numerous contrasts and parallels with the descriptions of the Messianic time and the Messianic picture in the later Jewish writings. The eschatological sphere of ideas of Paul, that is, his view of the last things and the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth through the Messiah, like that of the evangelists, can only be understood in connection with the parallel notions of the Judaism of that time. The prevailing difference that Judaism expected the "advent" of the Messiah, while Christianity looked for

the "return" of Jesus, is not very great, so much the less since the Christians themselves also spoke of the "advent" and not of the "return" of Christ.

Eschatological passages in the Pauline Epistles like 1 Thess. 4. 16, 17; 2 Thess. 1. 7-12; 2. 3-12; 1 Cor. 15. 24-28, 51-55; even 2 Cor. 5. 1-10, by eliminating from them what is really Christian, could just as well stand in Jewish apocalypses. The Pauline, like the Jewish apocalyptics, knows a Messiah whose coming will close the course of the present world and bring in the future. Here, as there, is the belief that the dawn of the Messianic period is immediately at hand. Here, as there, is the idea of the preëxistence of the Messiah; here, as there, his appearance on earth is described in a kindred manner: he destroys the powers of darkness, the ungodly angelic powers; overcomes Satan and destroys all enemies of God; but his own he fills with righteousness, wisdom and power, and establishes a kingdom of peace. As the judge of the world he comes in the clouds of heaven accompanied by his holy angels, with the sound of the trumpet of judgment. He raises the dead, changes the

living, renews creation. He is endowed with the glory of heaven, the manifestation of God, and enjoys adoration. His kingdom, however, is not of eternal duration, but his dominion is succeeded by the dominion of God which lasts forever.

It is clear that the most essential ideas of Jewish apocalyptics have been received into the theology of Paul; but this problem becomes still more complicated by this, that we not only find the same apocalyptic picture among the evangelists, but Jesus himself expressed his coming again in apocalyptic forms of thought. For the Danielic picture of the Son of man which Jesus applied to himself, is essentially apocalyptic. In a solemn hour before the high priest our Lord answered the question whether he be the Messiah, with a yea, and added: "hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven" (Matt. 26. 64). He also thought of his coming again as impending. As Son of man he also claimed for himself the dominion and the judgment of the world (Matt. 25. 31 sqq.; 16. 27; 19. 28 sq.).

A section of present theological science

rightly assumes that in the primitive Christian theology more room was given to these eschatological apocalyptic thoughts than was the case with Jesus; but we shall never succeed in clearly separating these developments from Jesus' self-testimony. In Paul we must in any case acknowledge a twofold influence in this sphere of ideas—that of the apocalyptics of his time, and also that of the teaching of Jesus. As Jesus himself, so Paul sees in Jesus the future—and in part already present—King of the kingdom and judge of the world; and against the entire Jewish apocalyptics he agrees with Jesus in this, that he eliminates everything political from the Messianic picture of the future, and delineates it purely religiously, a difference which can only be historically explained from dependence of Paul on Jesus.

But here there is manifested a desire to oppose a prevalent, yea, an almost ruling conception of Paulinism. One meets again and again with efforts to present the eschatological expectation as the kernel of Paul's belief in Christ. If this is correct, Paul does indeed not specially surpass his time. The difference between him and the older apos-

tles—and the Judaism of that time, was in the main this, that he identified the Messiah expected from heaven with the man Jesus, and that in the Spirit, given already as earnest of the future Messianic blessings, he saw the firm pledge of the speedy coming of the kingdom of God. In that case the main stress of the religious thoughts of Paul would not rest on that which, in the church of that time, was revived with divine powers through the risen and exalted Christ and on that which Jesus has been in his earthly appearance, but on the future, in the consummation which Christ shall bring when he comes again.

But the importance of the historically great lies not in what it has in common with its surroundings and time, but in what it differs, in the new which it brings as leaven into the period of development. In apocalyptic thoughts Paul also paid his tribute to his time. How could it be otherwise? No thinker can free himself from the perceptive world and apprehensive material of his time; but our statement of Paul's Christian belief also shows that the telling effect of his religious life is rather the triumphant conscious-

ness of having already made a real experience of the divine life, and as having known himself already in possession of redemption. Paul already feels himself as a new creature. He knows that nothing can separate him from the love of God which saved him in Christ Jesus. He is justified; has access already to God; can call him Father; the spirit of joyous trust and gladness quenches all suffering, and again and again obtains in him the upper hand. That which Luther, with the longing of his soul thirsting after salvation learnt from Paul, and that which leads us also again and again to Paul, is the certainty of salvation which hails with shouts of joy from his Epistles.

Only when this is ascertained can the other side also be rightly estimated, the hope of justification in the final judgment; the anxious expectation of the completion of redemption; the sincere striving to be wholly united with Christ; the wish to throw off everything which still binds him to this world and to be clothed upon with the heavenly body. Paul is the apostle of faith; and this faith is the inner connection of the believer with the object of his faith.

As the inseparable union of the believer with Christ, he considers the appropriation of that which is Christ's already in the present. The future can only complete what the present has already given to him of the glorious experience of salvation.

In the degree, however, that this is perceived does the unsatisfactory character of the essentially eschatological setting of the Pauline Christology appear. It must also be considered that Paul has not taken over into his ideal world the most important eschatological idea of the preaching of Jesus —that of the Son of man. In addition to the eschatological elements of the apostle's belief in Christ, which in their importance must certainly not be depreciated, one will have to mention others, and they are such which for the apostle constitute for all time the unchanging norm of Christian greatness.

The first is, that Paul experienced Christ as a real power which entered his life and created him anew. This kind of experience, as we have seen above, was of a person to a person, the self-manifestation of the heavenly Christ to the apostle. As to its content, Paul understood this experience only as divine;

and here lies the real cause—that he puts Christ not on the side of humanity, but ascribes to him divinity. What he received from Christ no man could give him, but only a being of divine origin and of divine power.

It belongs to every science to explain facts. Only in the degree that it is successful can we be satisfied with a scientific hypothesis; and he only can obtain a position relative to the questions concerning the origin of the Christ belief who himself stands within this connection. Whoever will understand the poet, must go to the poet's land.

From the consciousness that the living Christ has also apprehended us and made us his possession, can we understand the conviction of the apostle that the new experience in his life was not planted from immanent causes, but by the supernatural Christ. But he, who from the start rejects a Christ who did not remain in death but who rose again and is exalted to God, and from thence makes known to his people his royal power, will never be able to do justice to the apostle. But let not him who occupies that position claim that he alone judges scientifically. The supreme principle of this mode of con-

sideration is a dogma which is just as good as any other dogma. We refer, in the sense of Paul, to the nature of religious experience; for this rests not on scientific evidence, on reasons which may be demonstrated, but its mighty fortress is that which the mind can now still experience, and what has become efficacious is an historical reality. With Paul we can experience the fact that we have a Christ in heaven who is rightly over us. From Paul we can learn what God's revelation is to man: a creative act, a new life, the effective experience of a power surpassing and overcoming this world.

This Christ was seen by the apostle in heavenly brightness, in the glory of the manifestation of God. But this heavenly appearance was that of the man Jesus. The Jesus who walked on this earth and the heavenly Lord and King was the same person. By submitting to this Christ, Paul entered into connection with the belief of the primitive church; for it were an entirely erroneous opinion should one assert that Paul was the first who affirmed divine predicates of Jesus. Even the older apostles only came forth with the preaching of Christ

after they had experienced the divine power of Jesus. There is no gospel of Christ which did not preach him as the heavenly Lord and King. The same men who sailed with Jesus on the Galilean Sea and ate and drank with Him, had proclaimed with death-defying courage and firm gladness the same Jesus as the Lord who was exalted to the right hand of God, who gave his people divine powers and life and made them sure of heavenly perfection. The addresses of Peter in the first part of the Acts of the Apostles bear eloquent testimony that the primitive apostolic Christ-picture was also eclipsed by heavenly splendor.

But the primitive apostles also did not come to such faith, such preaching of Jesus, by accident. For their wonderful declarations they have a very solid basis, as can be ascertained from the Synoptic Gospels. It is not in this that Jesus enjoyed on earth merely an inspired human consciousness. He meant to be more than a hero of humanity. The number of self-testimonies, depositions, prophecies and miraculous deeds can only be explained on the supposition that Jesus intended to manifest by them his divine

authority on earth. Already on earth Jesus, with full consciousness over against men, linked himself closely to a union with God and claimed to embody God's revelation to humanity. This is not the place to prove this in detail; but the most important is to be said. Jesus claimed to be the Messiah sent of God and to fulfill in his person what the Old Testament expected of the appearance of God himself at the end of the ages. As Son of man he exercised on earth divine authority in forgiving sin; and of divine power over human disease. He made the lame to walk, the deaf to hear, raised the dead, and they did as he commanded. He declared that to him, as Son of man, belonged future divine power, dominion and dignity and the judgment of the world. He knew himself as the Son of God in a unique sense; who was exalted over the angels; whose essence no one knew but God, the Father; who stood in the relation of mutually perfect knowledge with the Father; who through revelation must draw men into his communion with God, if they would have part in it. He appeared as the new lawgiver of his own authority, not like the prophets

with the word "thus saith Jehovah," and depreciated and abolished what in the Old Testament did not answer to the perfect will of God. In the temple he acts as if he were its Lord; he is more than the temple; he is Lord also of the Sabbath day. Men shall be judged according to their relation to him; for he demands belief in his person. True, that he walks through the dark valley of suffering and death, but also toward the resurrection and the heavenly glory.

These elements were contained in the Christ-belief which Paul, the Pharisee, persecuted. He oppressed this belief because it seemed to him a falsehood and false testimony. But he must have known the Christ-preaching of the primitive church, otherwise he could not have reasonably persecuted it. Yea, the fanatical zeal of the Pharisee can historically only be thus understood, that Paul saw clearer than his contemporaries the incompatibility of this preaching with Jewish belief. Before Paul became a Christian he knew that a new principle of salvation had entered the world, that Judaism had received its death-blow if the Christian preaching rested on truth.

But from the epistles of the apostle it can also be ascertained that the historical, human person of Jesus stood clearly before the spiritual eye of Paul. It has been tried to enhance this proof by this, that one imagined to be able to show in the Pauline Epistles the traces of the use of an evangelical tradition already fixed in writing. I cannot consider this effort as successful. Paul knew the gospel matter from oral teaching; but his knowledge of it was more comprehensive than appears from a superficial consideration.

New phenomena produce new ideas. Paul employed the term *agape,* love, to designate the love which only became real in Christianity. The Old Testament indeed knows God's loving disposition toward his covenant-people and the demand of man's love for God emanating from it, but not however the personal loving union between God and man, which the experience of salvation involves. The spirit of the Greeks knows it not, can know it still less than the Old Testament, much as Plato has deepened the idea of love in the "Banquet" in the beautiful myth of Eros the son of poverty and of

riches. Paul, and after him John, comprised in this word what to them was the deepest experience of the Christian state. The apostle feels himself apprehended by such an overwhelming love of God in Christ that he feels himself "constrained" by it (2 Cor. 5. 14); the meaning is: that he cannot rid himself of the power of this experience; it gives him his life's direction: "Love, I give myself to thee, thine forever, ever thine to be" (Gal. 2. 20). The love of God is shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost which is given unto him (Rom. 5. 5). From this love no earthly and no angelic power can separate him (Rom. 8. 35).

In these and similar statements of Paul the love of Christ and of God in the death of Christ, stands in the foreground of his reflection. The love of Christ as shown in his life is not precluded. On the contrary, this latter has also encircled the heart of the apostle. In Ephesians 4. 32—5. 2, where Paul enjoins the commandment of love, the elements of the evangelical preaching are clearly his basis. Between the two chapters in which the apostle instructs the Corinthians on the value of the spiritual gifts, we read in the

first Epistle to the Corinthians a chapter which we generally call the Song of Songs of love; it is the thirteenth. It is rather out of the connection because in the whole chapter nothing is said of "love"; and yet the apostle introduces it in a special manner. He just said that not all have the same gifts, not all can be apostles, prophets, teachers, etc., and then enjoins: "but covet earnestly the best gifts." But he interrupts himself and goes on—"and yet shew I unto you a more excellent way," and now he begins that praise of love which has not its equal in the entire literature of the world. Whence did he derive the tunes which touch our heart like the music of the spheres? Behind everything that he says stands the historical form of the great Son of man. The first verses already contain numerous allusions to words of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels; then he goes on: "Charity suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not, charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up; doth not behave itself unseemly; seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth

all things, endureth all things." In every feature we see as a model the life of Jesus. There is no other model for such a description; for this charity did not exist in the world before, nor contemporaneously with, Jesus. And when Paul closes the chapter with the words: "And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity," we look again into the deepest life-experience, the deepest Christ-experience, and the deepest God-experience which he had. Since Christ's appearance in the world, we know that charity is the primitive force of God, destined to permeate and to fill the whole world.

From the proof of love in the life of Christ the apostle derived directly also certain moral principles and supreme maxims (Rom. 15. 2 sq.; Phil. 2. 4 sqq.; 1 Cor. 10. 33; 11. 1; Phil. 2. 20 sq.; Gal. 6. 2).

An important feature in the picture which the apostle had in his heart of the earthly work of Christ, is that of suffering. By this is not meant the Atoning death which Paul certainly also appreciated in its ethical importance, but the fact that in following Christ the thought of suffering was embodied

in the Pauline Christianity as an inalienable momentum of the ideal of life. We find this thought with Paul not only in the original phrase, that this suffering is a suffering of Christ himself, or on behalf of Christ, but he clearly also refers in the descriptions of his apostolic sufferings to the pattern of Jesus. Thus 1 Cor. 4. 8-13, where he presents the commandments of the Sermon on the Mount, to endure persecutions (Matt. 5. 11, 12), and to bless those that curse (Luke 6. 28), as being fulfilled in his apostolic life, and where some other materials from the evangelic tradition are, in his mind, as types. The Lord would not have reproached Paul with: "thou mindest not the things which are of God, but of men." The precepts which Jesus gave to his disciples after the Messiah-confession near Cæsarea Philippi with reference to the sufferings which should follow and what he himself showed in his life, Paul has rightly apprehended and presented in his life; and of this element of the Christian life-ideal it may also be said what we said of love, Jesus was the first who taught us to know suffering in its full ethical importance. Like his Mas-

ter, Paul connects most intimately the obedience of suffering with the certainty of victory and the grandeur of glorification. Impotency and weakness, sufferings and humiliations are the lot of the Christian, for Christ also was crucified through weakness (2 Cor. 13. 4), and yet, what glorious confidence of victory fills the apostle! The power of Christ, who was the same at the time of earthly humiliation and heavenly exaltation, fills him; he knows that it will also lead him to the goal. That the Christian must rejoice in suffering and persecution, the apostle shows in the First Epistle to the Thessalonians and especially in the Epistle to the Philippians; hence it is certainly an after-effort of the earthly work of Christ when Paul (1 Thess. 5. 16-18) finds the ideal of the Christian life in this, to preserve joyfulness in all conditions of life; to always have a prayerful frame of mind and thus have cause to thank God in every station of life; for he says: "This is the will of God in Christ Jesus concerning you." Just this will of God which has become manifest in the life of Jesus Christ.

According to 2 Thess. 3. 5, we also find

in Christ's life the Christian virtue of patience, the religious manifestation of power, the perseverance which results from the consciousness of overcoming the world. The apostle knows that Christ in his earthly life was meek, gentle and friendly, and he feels the implicit obligation to apply himself to the like mind in following his Lord (2 Cor. 10. 1).

Paul wishes to be considered by his congregations as a model of moral conduct (1 Thess. 2. 10; 2 Thess. 3. 7, 9; Phil. 3. 17). He knows the deep effect and the conquering power of love devoted to the service of his fellow man. He knows that this is the surest proof of the divine truth of Christianity; hence, he also says (1 Thess. 1. 6; 1 Cor. 11. 1) that in this he only follows Christ. How was this possible unless he had a very concrete picture of the earthly work of Jesus? Also the description of his apostolic office (2 Cor. 6) is only an image of the earthly work of Jesus. From himself or from religious abstractions Paul had found neither this ideal nor the power of its realization.

The character of the entire life of Jesus impressed Paul as Christian, as being divine,

not as Pharisee, for this life-ideal is different from that of Pharisaism. And how before his conversion could he have been able to see in the life of Jesus a divine nature since the surest principle of his religious thinking was that of the divinity of the Jewish law, and he could not think of considering its Pharisaic conception as ungodly, as Jesus did. But when Paul, as Christian, wishes to educate his congregations for a truly godly character, he points to the model, Christ. Very beautifully is this done (1 Thess. 4. 1-3, 7). The object of the Christian state is holiness, the opposite of uncleanness; for this God has called, who himself is holy. To such character Paul exhorts them "by the Lord Jesus"; he gave them commandments "by the Lord Jesus." It would mean much too little should one think here only of the teaching of Jesus, perhaps of the Sermon on the Mount. "To exhort by the Lord Jesus" means, to exhort from the life-communion with Jesus, and the commandments which Paul gave through the agency of the Lord Jesus are such, which in the person of Jesus had been a living reality. The same refers to the "tradition which ye received of us" (2

Thess. 3. 6; 2. 15). These are the evangelic traditions and the moral injunctions resulting therefrom. In Jesus the apostle met with divine perfection and divine holiness; for says he, in another place—not under the influence of the Jewish Messianic dogmatics, but under the impression of his new creation through the historical Christ—that Jesus knew no sin (2 Cor. 5. 21). We notice in the sublime picture of Christ which lived in the apostle, that a full share belongs also to the humanity of Christ. The religious conviction of Paul of the divinity of Christ, rests also on the life of the earthly Jesus.

All the different constituent parts mentioned before, Paul gathered up in a uniform picture of Christ. The coloring of the descriptions of the second coming is for the most part borrowed from the apocalyptics, in a lesser degree it refers back to Jesus himself. The Davidic sonship of Jesus is for Paul, as well as for the Judaism of his time, a postulate of the Messianic dogmatics. The comprehension of Christ as the last Adam betrays the Jewish scheme of thought; Alexandrian typology is found in this that he sees the preëxistent Christ in the spiritual work

which followed in the wilderness. Analogies in the religious ideas of his time induced him to consider Christ as the mediator of reconciliation, also of the entire cosmos, as the power which is destined to permeate all beings, be they in heaven, on earth or under the earth. The conception also of Christ as being preëxistent with God before his appearance on earth, has certain analogies in ancient contemporaneous thinking.

In later Jewish theology the idea of the heavenly preëxistence of the Messiah is not unknown, but it plays no particular part. It meets us in the allegories of the Book of Enoch and the apocalypse of Ezra, and then again in the appendix to the Pesitka Rabbati, in the seventh or eighth century. In Enoch and in 4 Ezra, the Messiah as "Son of Man" is preëxistent. The name of the Son of man is mentioned before the Lord of the Spirits, ere the sun and the signs of the zodiac were made (Enoch 48. 3). Since the idea of the Son of man was of little importance for Paul, he can hardly have been influenced therewith.

The Synoptic Gospels contain no statements of Jesus concerning his preëxistence,

but in the Gospel of John; words like "Before Abraham was, I am" (John 8. 58) cannot be invented. Jesus must have said this; but we cannot prove that Paul referred to self-testimonies of Christ concerning his preëxistence.

Also the following reflection cannot be proved from Paul: the Christian who experienced the divinity of Christ must conclude that this Christ is radically different from us, and did not first begin to exist as man. If he is of divine nature, he existed ere he became man. One does not become a God, one is God, or is not God.

But as Son of God Christ was preëxistent, for he came down from heaven and ascended again. This idea may in our days be considered as a myth; indeed with higher contents than the known myths of the Greek and Oriental sons of the gods; but one finds that it must be positively judged after the analogy of the narratives. Paul is said to owe in good part the success of his Christian preaching in the Græco-Roman world to the circumstance that he proclaimed Christ in a manner intelligible also to the Greeks as the Son of God.

The formal analogy with Greek and Oriental myths can be denied as little as the dependence of Paul on ancient cosmology which appears in this idea. But Paul himself would have been the first to resist being put under this scheme of contemplation with his doctrine of the divine Sonship of Jesus. He himself would have pointed out the fundamental difference that there we have embodiments of human thoughts and wants; whereas God himself came to men in his Son Christ, and manifested himself to them. In all passages in which Paul speaks of Christ as the Son of God, even where reference is made to preëxistence, the emphasis rests on the carrying out of God's work of salvation by this his Son, on the historical agency of the earthly Christ, who was afterward exalted to God.

For this reason the Pauline understanding of Jesus, the Son of God, refers in the main to Jesus's own conception of his divine Sonship, as it can be elicited from the Synoptic Gospels, especially Matt. 11. 27; Luke 10. 22; only that Paul put a theological dress on that which was with Jesus an immediate consciousness.

The ancient cosmology of a spatial heaven stretching over the earth we have no more, but we also lift our eyes upward to God, from whom comes our help, and sing of Christ:

> "Thou hast taken thy course earthward
> And gone again heavenward."

Even the modern man can do no other than seek God in Christ, this Christ of history who is in heaven above us.

On the other hand, under the influence of contemporary philosophical and religious thoughts of Christ as Creator of the world, this understanding is not based on the world of salvation of Christ, but it was natural in comparison with definitions of the world, like the Philonean or Gnostic-Oriental speculations, in which such mediators between God and the world were pushed in, to assign Christ a parallel position. In such statements Paul goes indeed beyond the line of primitive Christian preaching. In that, however, as concerns the description of the work of salvation and power of Christ, the difference between Paul and the older apostles consists in this, that Paul brings out more vivid-

ly what already existed in reality, or, that the personal Christ experience of the apostle Paul was larger every way and more intense than that of Christians before him.

In the experience of salvation founded on the person of Christ, the apostle comprised also certain theological, doctrinal views, the most important of which we now must briefly sketch. They relate to the doctrines of redemption, reconciliation, and justification by faith. If they concerned only the personal experience of the apostle in his conversion, the heavenly Christ, who drew the apostle into his communion and endowed him with his Spirit, Christ who rose again would be the cardinal point of Paul's theology, but, as a Jew, the apostle stood within a history of divine revelation. He believed in a God who manifests himself in the world; whose will must be known from his historical deeds. The Messiah on the cross was a blasphemous idea to Paul, the Jew, but when he perceived that the Son of God did indeed die on the cross, he could only see in this a new, indeed an unheard of, revealing act of God. Hence the cross of Christ became the decisive historical manifestation of God in his the-

ological thinking. In his theology the two by no means homogeneous principal facts of the salvation-work of Christ, the death on the cross and the resurrection, interlaced in a wonderful manner.

### REDEMPTION

For a successful theological understanding of Paul we must take a retrograde way in the real doctrine of redemption as well as in the Christology, starting from his Christian experience. One must free himself from the method of dogmatics which still rule the statements of Paulinism: bondage of sin, redemption, freedom. From the act of God alone in giving his Son to the cross, Paul fully perceived the guilt of humanity before God. He perceived this also because he felt himself transferred by Christ into the new sphere of freedom, divine adoption, and a life filled with the Spirit. Only as a new man did he rightly understand his former condition. The present experience of the Christian is by no means different. No unredeemed man knows the depth of human sin; he only knows who is renewed by Christ.

These thoughts come out strongest in Rom. 8. 1 sqq. The keenness of the antagonism between flesh and spirit which runs through the theology and anthropology of Paul does not rest on a dualistic philosophy, but it was thus formed by the life-experience of the apostle and his Judaico-historical estimate of the death of the flesh of the Messiah on the cross.

The Son of God put on the same sinful flesh as other humanity. As Messiah he is the second Adam, the representative of entire humanity. What happens to him is efficacious for the entire humanity standing behind him. God, by making the bearer of the sinful flesh die on the cross, delivered him up as a sin-offering, and pronounced thereby the sentence of destruction on the sinful flesh of humanity. Now the Spirit rules in those who belong to Christ. Through the power of the Spirit the emotions of the flesh are kept down. The Spirit dwelling in us will sometime also be the power of our resurrection. That the real in the life of the individual and of the churches remains far behind this ideal by no means troubles the apostle. Here we see the power of his divine

faith. God has acted in the death of the flesh of Christ and shown whither his will tends. This will he will carry out with sovereign power. He planted the new life in Christians, who already feel that the transcendent Spirit lives and works in them. How should God leave unfinished the work which he began?

But this doctrine contains another, that of the general absolute sinfulness of the human soul. This also is not a result of philosophy nor of a dualistic conception of the world. A real dualism is for Paul not to be thought of, considering the liveliness and depth of his divine faith. He knows no second principle of the world which could seriously oppose the power of God. The apostle frequently even claims Satan as a power whose work is included in God's government of the world (1 Cor. 5. 5; 2 Cor. 12. 7; 1 Thess. 2. 18). Man when he came forth from the hand of God was good. Sin is not in man as an essential element of the flesh, but is a power which subsequently entered history. Adam brought it into the world and ever since it has obtained sovereignty over the entire human race. God received it into his plan

of salvation. But he punished it by inflicting death on Adam and the entire human race; but in the death of Christ he prepared salvation which abolished the first sentence, and through Christ he appointed life as the sovereign power over humanity (Rom. 5. 17 sqq.). Thus the effect of the death of Jesus as the head of humanity and of his transition to heavenly life is this, that before the bar of God's judgment those also who belong to Christ have suffered death and entered into heavenly life (Eph. 2. 5 sq.).

Just as we were redeemed from the power of the flesh, so are we also redeemed through the death of Christ from the curse of the law (Gal. 3. 13). In a vicarious manner Christ, on the other hand, has offered himself for us. The Old Testament passage (Deut. 21. 22 sq.): "and if a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he shall be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree, his body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day; for he that is hanged is accursed of God," he saw fulfilled in Christ. After Christ hath borne for us the curse, this law has no more any claim on us. We died

according to the sentence of the law and for the law (Gal. 2. 19). Christ delivered us also from the power of darkness (Col. 1. 13); from this present evil world (Gal. 1. 4); he spoiled the angelic powers in whose power is the law (Col. 2. 15; Gal. 4. 3), that ruled over this present world (1 Cor. 2. 8); but nowhere in these passages is there any lack of the conviction that Christ, his Spirit, his life, has now become powerful in us, or that we are transferred into his kingdom.

From what has been said it follows that redemption cannot be thought of as being limited to Judaism. If the death of Christ is conceived of as the fundamental destruction of the sinful flesh, *humanity* is the object of redemption. The gospel is universal. But God's purpose of salvation is also universal. God willed that the entire humanity, Jew and Gentile, should be saved, those also who are still in unbelief (Rom. 11. 25 sqq.; 1 Tim. 2. 4). In the end, nothing but the will of God is to rule the world. This thought also finds its application to the angelic powers which according to Paul and the notion of that time in general rule in the world. These are already deprived of their

power through Christ, as we have seen above; their final overthrow is the task of Christ at his second coming (1 Cor. 15. 24 sq.). No anti-godly influence shall remain in the cosmos. But if redemption concerns the entire former territory of these powers, nature also has a part in it. According to Rom. 8. 19 sqq., irrational nature for Adam's sake has through God become subject to the curse of vanity, under which it groaneth and travaileth in pain like man; but it shall also be delivered from this bondage to the glorious liberty of the children of God. The glory of God shall then be the nature of man, of angels and of the creation. Thus the Pauline doctrine of redemption, like the Christology, ends with the central and universal significance of Christ. Christ, as the Creator, is also the Redeemer of the universal cosmos.

### Reconciliation

In various intricate relations with the doctrine of the redemption and parallel to it we meet in Paul the conviction of reconciliation effected through Christ. But this sphere of ideas differs from that of the redemption in

this, that it overwhelmingly characterizes the work of God for man's salvation under a special point of view, and suggests correct principles of conduct, while in the doctrine of redemption the feeling of deliverance from an anti-godly state, that is, the human side of the consideration, comes out more strongly. Paul's theistic conception of the world of Paul appears fully in the thought of reconciliation.

According to our usage, reconciliation denotes the abolishment of an enmity existing between persons or parties, an arrangement by which both hitherto hostile parts agree and a state of peace is brought about. This idea cannot be applied, as a matter of course, to the Pauline doctrine of reconciliation. True, Paul speaks of God's wrath which rests upon the pre- and extra-Christian world, a world brought into the bondage of sin and a life of vice with all abominations resulting therefrom (Rom. 1. 18 sqq., also 1 Thess. 2. 16). Paul speaks of this wrath in a sense that man before his reconciliation is hated of God (Rom. 11. 28; 5. 10). Man also shows enmity against God (Rom. 8. 7), which is ever stirred up anew because of his

inability to fulfill the law of commandments (Eph. 2. 14, 15). If one followed up these statements it would appear that the reconciliation is a change in God as well as in men. God would perhaps restrain his wrath on account of the expiatory act of Christ which satisfies him; and on the part of men everything would appear as being removed by the death of Christ, everything that led them in enmity against God: sin, law, flesh.

But this is not the thought of the apostle. Paul does not consider Christ as the third party, who mediates between two enemies and makes peace. The reconciling work of Christ is not something absolute, independent of God, to which God had to submit after it had been done. And just as little does Paul consider humanity as an equally entitled party, beside God, who had the liberty of taking a friendly or hostile attitude toward God. In the Pauline doctrine of reconciliation God acts entirely free; God, and he alone, undertakes the work of reconciliation; it is he who sent Christ to bring about reconciliation, and love toward the world is the motive which moved him (Rom. 5. 8 sqq.). The question cannot be of a change in God;

that a wrathful God became gracious. But God produced a relation between himself and humanity in which he could show himself merciful to them. On this account the term "reconciliation" is inadequate, and like the "wrath of God" expresses something anthropathic. In Paul's ideas of reconciliation the very eminence and free grace of God over against the creature is beautifully expressed.

To be sure, God's attitude toward humanity prior to reconciliation is different from that after reconciliation. Before, God in his long-suffering allowed transgressions to pass on or he revealed his wrath because of human sin. As a righteous God, who must hate and punish sin as an anti-godly thing, this attitude toward humanity was not final. In the death of Christ, in making him to be sin for us, who knew no sin (2 Cor. 5. 21), God showed that he had destroyed sin in Christ. Therefore on this account the cross of Christ stood visibly and publicly as the means of propitiation established by God for humanity (Rom. 3. 25). God's judicial righteousness was satisfied by the death of Christ. In his Son he showed that the moral constitution of the world must be satisfied;

but the Son of God did not succumb in this judgment, he came forth victor. Whoever, with reference to this divine judgment itself, now feels himself subject to like sentence, unto him God for Christ's sake counts not sin; but regards him as if he died with Christ the death of sinners.

The apostolic office is, therefore, called the "ministry of reconciliation" (2 Cor. 5. 18). To humanity the call is issued "to be reconciled to God," that is, to accept what God offers and to enter into a state of peace with God. Humanity has nothing else to do than to submit to this new order of God; and where this is the case there is peace between God and humanity (Rom. 5. 10, 11). Before God man stands holy, unblamable, unreprovable (Col. 1. 22), and is in possession of the sure expectancy of the completion of salvation in the life to come (Rom. 5. 11).

The range of the work of reconciliation is as universally conceived of by the apostle as that of redemption, because reconciliation also rests on the blessing of the death of Christ. In Christ God reconciled "the world" unto himself (2 Cor. 5. 19). The heathen, like the Jews, have part in the

reconciling work of Christ who, in his *own* body, reconciled both parts of humanity on the cross; made them a new humanity and in *one* Spirit obtained for them access to God (Eph. 2. 14 sqq.). In like manner also the angelic powers, standing behind all earthly things, ruling the cosmos, are reconciled through the blood of the cross of Christ. Peace has been made in heaven as well as upon earth (Col. 1. 20).

### JUSTIFICATION AND FAITH

Under the influence of the Lutheran Reformation Paul's doctrine of justification is still considered as the real coinage of the Pauline doctrine of salvation. The being "justified by faith only," personal experience, the war-cry and victorious banner of Luther fighting against Roman perversion of the gospel, is regarded as the preaching by which Paul also subdued the world of his time for Christianity. And yet the idea of justification is only one of the different forms in which the Christian faith of the apostle clothed itself. In so far as justification concerns an act of God, the doctrine is parallel to reconciliation, redemption, salva-

tion. As far as the religious experience of man is considered, the same content is found in forgiveness of sin, reception of life, regeneration, divine adoption. But as little as in the alleged parallels shall we find a real systematic doctrine in the thought of justification as taught by Paul. We shall soon see that this sphere of ideas of Paul does not contain firmly united, systematically arranged, thought-connections. There is rather a loose construction of religious thoughts which are applied once this way, then another way; then joined to already given ideas and finally leading to a recast, yea, to a breaking up of the old material. Only in an accomodative way can one speak of a *doctrine* of justification by Paul.

The proposition of justification by faith was formed by Paul in polemics. It is the Christian antithesis to the Jewish perversion of the fundamental relation of a man to God. In no other proposition does the fundamental difference of Christianity and Judaism become so significantly obvious as in the assertion that man is justified by faith and not by works. Since Luther had to oppose a like perversion of religion in the Catholic Church,

he put this Pauline proposition in the center of his teaching and made it the material-principle of Protestantism.

The Greek term for our "to justify" belongs not alone to biblical language; it denotes generally "to judge favorably," "to deem righteous," "to treat as righteous," and this is in consequence of a formal examination or judicial decision. In the Old Testament and post-canonical Judaism, this word is referred to the religious sphere of life, and generally denotes the sentence which God passes in the Messianic final term, or at the close, or, also in the course of life, upon man and his acts. Justification expresses, then, the acknowledgment of actual righteousness, whether it be perfect or not. The Jew, he who belongs to the covenant-people, who in the main has done what God required of him, may expect from God a verdict of justification. Solomon prayed (1 Kings 8. 32, LXX): "Judge thy people Israel, that the wicked be declared wicked, and justifying the righteous, to give him according to his righteousness." In this sense of acknowledging the actual righteousness of man through God, occurs the term "to justify"

(Jas. 2. 21, 24, 25), which represents the Jewish doctrine of justification, also by Paul, Rom. 2. 13; 3. 20; Gal. 2. 16; also 1 Tim. 3. 16.

But the Judaism of that time no longer stood on the height of belief in the gracious God as he appears in the Prophets and in the Psalms, ready to forgive sins and to cover up guilt. Judaism understood the relation of man to God as a mutual covenant-relation from a judicial point of view. God gave his people the law and ritual, now it depended on man whether he would live according to the ordinances of God or not. God, it was thought, kept an account of every man according to the state of the debit and credit we should expect in the course of life, and at its close God gave his decree which would either condemn man or reward his righteousness.

Here Paul stepped in with a new understanding of justification. This view rendered to God what belonged to him; directed man to perfect subordination under God; excluded every wrong relation of religion and morality, and delivered man from the torment of perpetual uncertainty of salva-

tion. Paul, too, uses the term "to justify" in a forensic sense, that is, it is borrowed from legal language. He also conceives it as the principal concern of the godly to obtain the justifying judgment of God; but in harshest opposition to Jewish legal views, to all human legal practice, even against God's own legal rules—"keep thee far from a false matter; and the innocent and righteous stay not, for I will not justify the wicked" (Exod. 23. 7)—Paul demands belief in God who justifieth the ungodly (Rom. 4. 5). This demand stands in connection with the new idea of righteousness which Paul obtained as a Christian. For it must be insisted that the Greek expression "to justify" is not connected with right but with righteousness, and "to declare as righteous" denotes "to judge as righteous." But the fact also exists, that Paul put into that term its opposite; and thus cancelled the original idea.

Paul had to learn that aspiration after one's own righteousness is vain, and that man must receive everything, even his righteousness, from God. His particular understanding of justification is also traced back to his experience before Damascus. When

this is understood the exaggerations of the eschatological conception of justification which one must read again and again in biblical theologies and dissertations on justification fall to pieces. But the statistical record of his statements should teach something better. Paul speaks of future justification, setting aside those passages in which he moves on the ground of the Jewish doctrine of justification, in Gal. 5. 4-6; Rom. 3. 30, and 4. 24; 5. 19; 1 Cor. 4. 4 sq.; but of the present already: Gal. 2. 16, 17; 3. 8, 24; Rom. 3. 24, 26, 28; 4. 5; 8. 33; and even in the past the apostle imagines it as having taken place: 1 Cor. 6. 11; Rom. 5. 1, 9; also 8. 30. The ministry of the New Covenant is the ministry of righteousness (2 Cor. 3. 9), that is, a ministry which works and diffuses righteousness in the present. The righteousness of God which works faith and comes from faith is a revealed one (Rom. 1. 17; 3. 21); it is a reality in the world; the Christian preaching makes it indigenous in humanity and accessible for all (1 Cor. 1. 30; 2 Cor. 5. 21; Rom. 5. 17; 10. 4 sqq., 10).

In the doctrine of justification as in other spheres of the Pauline conception of salva-

tion, the eschatological mode of consideration is of unmistakable importance, because Paul expects the full enjoyment of salvation only in the future. But that which gives the peculiar stamp to his preaching is here not eschatology but the consciousness of enjoying blessedness already in the present; the overwhelming feeling of happiness in being already free from judgment and of experiencing God's justification. God called him, the worker, to the kingdom of his Son. This took place not because Paul, as a pious Jew, took the law of God as the guide of his life, but in stern opposition to his legal endeavor. For this life-experience the Pauline antithesis is already explained as "not by works of the law." Paul had to assert this with all emphasis when the gospel of grace which he preached was opposed, and one demanded as a second principle of salvation the doing of the law in the name of Christianity in addition to the grace of God. With all emphasis and without yielding the breadth of a finger, Paul maintains here the proposition against Judaism and Jewish Christianity: "we are justified freely by the grace of God" (Rom. 3. 24; Titus 3. 7).

To the question: Whence comes man's righteousness? Paul has only *one* answer: From God! He is righteous to whom God gives his righteousness. This righteousness in general cannot be obtained in any other way than by God himself, by passing his sentence on man: I regard thee as righteous.

Without any secondary qualification, Paul can trace the entire course of human salvation to the act of God: "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified" (Rom. 8. 29, 30). All these divisions lie in the part God has rendered them. His counsel in favor of glorifying humanity is unchangeable; thus everything, though not yet fulfilled in reality, is absolutely certain. God's salvation-decree entered into historical manifestation which includes the justification of man, in Christ, his Son. God made him to be sin that we might be made the righteousness of God in him (2 Cor. 5. 21). Here the question is

not of a doing of men; God alone acts. In the death on the cross he put the whole human sin on his Son, that as judge he could transfer to us his own righteousness which was incarnated in his Son; and we, who formerly were all sin, now wholly become in Christ the righteousness of God. In like manner the apostle speaks (Rom. 5. 16, 18) of the bringing about of God's purpose of salvation in humanity, without assigning any part to man in the realization. Over against God's sentence of condemnation on entire humanity because of the transgression of the one, stands the sentence of justification which leads to life, after the second head of humanity has rendered the decisive act of obedience on the cross. According to Rom. 5. 9, men are now being justified in like manner "by the blood" of Christ, that is, in consequence of the expiatory death of Christ, God passed the decree of righteousness on humanity. The strange phrase, Rom 4. 25: Christ "was raised again for our justification" means nothing else. The raising again of Christ is presented as a consequence of God's sentence of acquittal and justification on men because of the atoning work of

Christ. Finally the death and raising again of Jesus (Rom. 8. 33) are also a cause of God's justification on humanity conceived of as lasting; and here also we read nothing of man's attitude.

From the passages referred to we obtain the qualification of justification. This takes place "in Christ" (2 Cor. 5. 21), and "by his blood" (Rom. 5. 9); according to Gal. 2. 17, it is also the effort of the Christian to be justified "by Christ"; for those who live in Christ Jesus need fear no condemnation (Rom. 8. 1). The justification of man takes place "in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and by the Spirit of our God" (1 Cor. 6. 11); and in 1 Cor. 1. 30 Christ himself is called our righteousness. As the basis of God's justification, Paul mentions once the sacrificial work of Christ, oftener however the fact of being in Christ. The being in Christ he puts in opposition (Gal. 5. 4; 3. 11) to the power of the law. He evidently means that justification takes place everywhere, where Christ is with his power, his work, his life.

It means nothing else when Paul speaks of "justification by faith" (Gal. 2. 16; 3. 8,

24; Rom. 3. 30; 5. 1); or "by faith" (Rom. 3. 30; Gal. 2. 16); or, "in virtue of faith" (Rom. 3. 28). Faith has with Paul various modifications of meaning, but he puts the most pregnant meaning into this idea where he makes it the content of his Christian experience of salvation. This idea of faith is found everywhere, where Paul puts justification in reference to faith. There faith is a joining together of man with Christ in an indissoluble unit. One would say much too little should he take this Pauline salvation-belief as a personal disposition, as confidence or trust. No, it is the apprehension of and the adhering to Christ with all that he has included in his gifts of salvation. It is such a close union of man with Christ that he can no more be thought of as being separated from him. Where man is, there also is Christ. When God regards and judges the believing man, it is as if Christ were included also.

With justification the whole of salvation is given to sinful man: Hence justification enters into an inner relation to other ideas in which Paul also presents the thought of redemption. Justification and reconciliation

stand parallel (Rom. 5. 9 sqq.), and assure safe redemption. Paul can well say: "he who is justified, shall be saved"; as also: "he who is reconciled, shall be saved." Salvation, however, he explains as an entrance into the life of God (Titus 3. 5, 7). The divine acts of saving and justifying are identical, they are an emanation of the grace of God and have for their end that we become heirs of God and obtain the hope of eternal life. According to 2 Cor. 5. 20 sq., man who, in the death of Christ, accepts the offered reconciliation, receives the righteousness of God in life-communion with Christ. In Rom. 10. 9 sq. the ideas of justification and salvation promiscuously change. The gospel brings salvation to every believer because the righteousness of God is revealed in him (Rom. 1. 16, 17). The idea of redemption is also connected (Rom. 3. 24) with justification; justification takes place through the mediation of the redemption existing in Christ.

The justification of man consists in the forgiveness of sins. In a classical manner Paul demonstrated this (Rom. 4. 5 sqq.). Unto the man who relies not on works but

believes in God, who justifies the wicked, this belief is imputed as righteousness. This declaration the apostle corroborates by an Old Testament quotation from Psa. 32. 1, 2: "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity." From this quotation Paul infers that God imputeth righteousness unto him who is thus pronounced as blessed. The forgiveness of sins is accordingly not only something negative but it includes also the imputation of the positive saving effect of righteousness. But righteousness stands for the apostle in just as inseparable a relation to "life," that is, to divine life, as sin does to death (Rom. 5. 12 sqq.). Where righteousness is, there also is life and blessedness. The ministration of the New Testament is called (2 Cor. 3. 9) the ministry of righteousness; in the preceding verse the ministration of the Spirit; but according to verse 6, the Spirit giveth life. Thus: where righteousness is, there is Spirit; where Spirit is, life is. In Col. 2. 13 also, the apostle has perceived the giving of life to Christians in communion with Christ in this, that God

has forgiven them all transgression and blotted out the handwriting of ordinances that were against them. In 1 Cor. 15. 54-57 the apostle rejoices that with the removal of sin through Jesus Christ, that is, in God's declaration of justification resting on the death of Christ, victory over death and life immortal has been given to humanity. In Gal. 3. 8 sqq. the fundamental thought of the discussion is this, that in justification the entire blessing is included; hence the apostle puts also baptism, the act of incorporating the believer into the Christian Church, in inner relation to justification. In 1 Cor. 6. 11, he adds in a parallel that the Christians were washed, that is, that they were baptized; that they were sanctified, and justified; accordingly, baptism, sanctification, and justification appertain to one another. Also the act of regeneration, that is, the renewal of man by the Holy Spirit, Paul identifies (Titus 3. 5-7) with the act of justification and conceives of both divine acts as having taken place in baptism.[1]

[1]The author here interprets Paul in harmony with the teaching of the Lutheran Church, but for a clear exposition of the Apostolic teaching see Dr. Whedon's note on Titus 3. 5–7 in Whedon's Commentary.—Editor.

Having shown the main thoughts of the Pauline teaching of justification we may now obtain a number of results for an estimate of the Catholic and evangelical conception of justification, as well as for questions which our present dogmatical science connects with the doctrine of justification.

According to its nature, justification is a declarative act of God. He declares he regards man as righteous because of the atoning death of Christ, which blotted out the sin of humanity. Neither the Catholic understanding as "infusion" of grace, nor that of the so-called biblical school of Beck as a communication of active righteousness, can be considered as correct. Man who is justified by God is rather still a sinner in the sense of Paul, after this declaration has been made. With a general intuition Luther touched the view of the apostle when he says in the Smalcald articles (13), that God "for the sake of Christ, our Mediator, will consider and does consider us as wholly righteous and holy. Though the sin in the flesh has not yet entirely disappeared and is dead, yet he will not avenge nor know it."[1]

[1] See Miley, Systematic Theology.—EDITOR.

The wrong understanding of Paul in the Catholic Church is connected with the un-Pauline notion of faith which prevails there. According to Roman Catholic teaching, faith is the ground and condition of divine justification. Faith appropriates righteousness by that alone, that it is not confined to knowledge but also fashions the will and works fear of God's righteousness, hope in his mercy, beginning of love, contrition and repentance. Only when, by the grace of God, faith becomes operative in the will does it obtain, according to Catholic teaching, the grace of justification. But by this notion justification has been molded into a dogmatic doctrine, which is not so with Paul. What the apostle expresses in different manner is squeezed into a fixed form; and what Paul understands by justifying faith, is turned into its opposite, for faith becomes again a work.

We have seen that Paul described justification as an act of God without considering the conduct of man. He can put the sentence of justification into the past, present and future. He can connect it with baptism and regeneration. He does not present quite

formally the relation of faith to justification. Faith is for him a presupposition, a means; once also (Rom. 3. 28) ground of justification. And yet it is a perversion of the true meaning of the apostle to present faith as the beginning of salvation. In his polemics against Judaism he used that term "in virtue of faith," which caused such a great misconception. Paul means there also nothing more than this, that where there is faith, comes God's declaration of justification, not where works are; but, of course, not the faith which is an act of man—as the Roman teaching describes it—but the faith which is wrought by God in man and constrains man to withdraw wholly from himself and to apprehend Christ, to put him on, and thus appear well-pleasing before God. When Paul once calls such faith the ground of justification, the connection makes it very clear how the apostle wishes to be understood.

But the opinion that God is satisfied with faith or good will as a lesser performance instead of actual obedience, bitterly wrongs the apostle. Saving faith for the apostle is never a somewhat valuable performance, but

is always the opposite of all performance. It is connection with the person of Christ. With this meaning also nothing is gained; for the foundation of our salvation would be yet a "work"; besides a "work" which man could produce still less by his own strength than by active obedience.

In pursuance of this understanding of justification by faith, according to the Pauline view, it gains further importance as Luther rightly apprehended and expressly asserted.

The justification of Paul contains more than the mere declaration of God, that for Christ's sake he regards the sinner as righteous. God laid our sins upon Christ that in communion with Christ we might be made the righteousness of God (2 Cor. 5. 21). This is not to be understood in the sense of imputation only, but also as active righteousness; for a life-communion with Christ can be interpreted in no other way than that it is followed by a new existence and a corresponding activity. When Paul says: "Christ lives in us," he means Christ pervades us with all his powers. When Paul (2 Cor. 3. 9) calls the ministration of the New Covenant the ministration of righteousness, active

righteousness is also included because this ministration is conceived of as the ministration of the Spirit (2 Cor. 3. 6). Says Paul (Rom. 1. 17) that God's righteousness is revealed in the gospel according to his own words, it is the argument of the statement that the gospel is the power of God; but this is something active which replenishes man. If Christ is called (1 Cor. 1. 30) "our righteousness," a limitation to imputed righteousness is inadmissible. Even in Rom. 5. 12 sqq. the contrast of the righteousness of the second Adam and the sin of the first Adam is suitable only when the righteousness of Christ transferred to us is also conceived of as active.

But this consideration finds also its confirmation from the idea of the Pauline belief. For the pithy words of the Pauline faith is this that in life communion with Christ Jesus, neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love (Gal. 5. 6). Here the Catholics, in order to maintain their doctrine of justification, must translate the Greek verb passively: "the faith, which by love became efficient," whereas the respective

verb is never used passively in the New Testament. Paul acknowledges here as the true inner disposition of the Christian a faith which shows his life's strength in works of love. This faith, because it brings Christ into our hearts, "kills the old Adam, makes entirely new men and brings the Holy Spirit. Faith is a living, active, busy, mighty thing, that it is impossible not to do good without ceasing" (Luther, in his Preface to the Epistle to the Romans).

The idea of justification appears much contrasted in the ancient church where reception into the church was taken as a justification-act. True, it is Pauline to closely connect baptism and justification, as well as faith and baptism; but the Pauline collective view of justification is, as we have seen, much richer.

On the other hand, Luther enlarged the doctrine of justification in so far as he included in it the daily forgiveness of sins. Herein lies the correct thought that God's declaration of justification is unchangeable and is not confused by the daily sin of the Christian; but Paul himself has not drawn this conclusion. True, he proves in the Epis-

tle to the Galatians that with justification all blessing is given (chapter 3. 8 sqq.), and that aspiration after justification by the law separates Christians from Christ (chapter 5. 4 sqq.). He therefore considers justification as effectual for the whole life of the Christian; but he stated this not directly and still less did he put forward daily forgiveness of sins as given in justification. Where he saw sin in the church he referred to God's faithfulness, who will perform the work which he hath once begun, and will also strengthen the moral power (1 Cor. 1. 8, 9; 2 Thess. 3. 3-5; Phil. 1. 6-11). Justification is a declaration passed by God on man under the view-point of eternity without regard to the fluctuations of the Christian life.

Our present dogmatical science searches into the psychological conditions under which faith originates and grows. To the problems which belong to it, belong also how faith and justification are related to one another. Every progress in the knowledge of the psychological events of the religious life is certainly to be welcomed thankfully. Such researches are necessary; but we must not forget the difference between our present

reflection, our present dogmatical ideas, and those teachings of the New Testament. One should be careful not to torment the apostle Paul with psychological queries for the solution of these problems. The question, When and how, for what presuppositions and personal attitude does God's justification set in over the individual? Paul did not ask himself at all. The present justification of man can be defined as the awakening of the belief in acquittal at the final judgment. One may say, that the fact of faith is somewhere included in the justifying act of God, but in this, modern dogmatical definitions rather than the thoughts of Paul are given. The apostle was no psychologist in the modern sense. His interest was toward God and objective salvation historically directed to acts in which God clearly and perceptibly speaks to humanity. Man is in the hand of God like the clay in the hands of the potter. Man has importance only in so far as he submits to the act of God and freely accepts what will lead him to communion with God; but for this very reason we owe to the apostle the masterly descriptions of the unredeemed and redeemed man (Rom. 7. and 8.; Gal.

5. 16 sqq.; Phil. 3. 4 sqq.). What was in him as a Christian and how this inner possession reformed him and worked in him, he represented in a manner overhelming to the modern man.

## III

### Jesus and Paul

1. Paul himself is the most public witness for the fact that he stands not in a relation of coördination but, at a far distance, in the most absolute dependence on Jesus. Jesus the Lord, Paul the servant. Jesus laid claim to be the revelation of God to humanity, to embody the will of God in humanity. The prophets, as servants and instruments of God, executed God's commands, but beyond this, according to their inner quality, they did not surpass mankind. Jesus, however, according to his person and his nature, was of a different kind than we sinful men. His life and work can only be understood as a phenomenon of divine life and of divine essence. This the apostle learned in the decisive hour in that crisis in his life before Damascus. Ever after one object inspired him: the reception of the life of Christ into his own life; to be pervaded and tried by the power of Christ till he himself became nothing else than "Christ."

2. Hence Paul apprehends the demand of Jesus, the Christian life-ideal in full purity. Yea, it may be said, that in the history of the Christian Church there is none other who so deeply and purely experienced the renewing life-and-love power of Jesus as the apostle Paul. Paul learned of Jesus that not the assertion of one's *ego*, not one's righteousness, not any other earthly good is the object of the God-intended human effort, but ministering love, humility, unselfishness, obedience, receptivity to God's gifts—these are the loftiest desires. "And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity." "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, meekness, temperance." He who coined these words and endeavored to realize them in his life has rightly understood Jesus.

3. Jesus brought his message from God, his heavenly Father, concerning the kingdom of God in which God's will of love and omnipotence should be perfected, concerning the call of man to moral perfection in God, concerning his task as the Son of man and the Son of God, to remove the obstacles opposing the coming of the kingdom of God,

that he may become Head and King in this kingdom. He did not do this in the form of theological statements, but from the depth of his united consciousness with God, almost as from immediate view, unreflected, guided by continuous divine revelation in his own official work. True, he gathered disciples around himself and tried to educate them for the understanding of the revelation of the divine will manifested in him; but he organized them not as a congregation or church, but left the seed to develop and form a body. When after his death the apostles felt themselves commissioned to come forth with the Christian preaching, that which was personal life and immediate view in Jesus had to be cast into the form of theological ideas and statements; a congregation had to be organized. In this work Paul had a considerable share, since he was the greatest theologian as well as the greatest organizer of the primitive Christian Church. But it cannot fail that, in such a coining of Christian doctrine as well as of ecclesiastical order, much was adopted which was individual and contemporaneous.

4. Jesus lived as the true son of his peo-

ple. He kept the law of his fathers and advised those whom he healed to fulfill the statutes of this law. He selected twelve disciples, to whom he promised that they should sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. He will fulfill the hope of Israel and bring about the completion of the Old Testament revelation of God and clothe his historical mission in the idea of Jewish Messianism. And yet, this Jewish cover falls from him or becomes an illumined veil as soon as we come in contact with him. He had nothing at all in his nature of the traditional narrowness of Judaism as it so often expressed itself in this people in passionate violence, in narrow-mindedness, in love, in hatred, in a certain conception of the world and history. His demand concerns not only the Jew, nor a certain time, it concerns man in general. In the Jew who is addressed man is intended. In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus recognizes Jewish scribism and the Pharisaic perversion of the Old Testament commandments, and yet almost every word is so that He could speak it to us today. In reading the Beatitudes, the conditions for entering into the kingdom of God, or the

parables of the kingdom of heaven, it seems to us as if he described our own wants and needs, the object of our hope, and everlasting laws of our genesis and growth.

None of the apostles perceived so clearly and keenly as Paul did that Jesus overcame Judaism and brought in a new religion of humanity. It was he who, in victorious struggle as a true follower of the Lord, compelled recognition of the universal character of Christianity and banished Jewish ceremonies from Christianity. He brought the religion of Jesus to the Greeks and Romans. His Jesus Christ, who addressed all men, who wished to make all children of God, who is rich unto all in heavenly goods and gifts, was not a self-made Christ but the historical Christ.

In the preaching of Paul he embraced the ancient world and apprehended us of today also with such overwhelming power that we can never permit the elimination of the Epistles of the apostle Paul from our Bible. And yet Paul was never wholly able to throw off Jewish limitations. As apostle he remained a Jew. In him there was nothing Hellenic. Greek wisdom and Greek culture, though not

uninfluenced by it, seemed to him foolishness beside the gospel. He did not foster it. He held to the Jewish view of the world, of history, of man. To him the history of humanity is the history of the Jewish people with the principal types, Adam, Abraham, Moses and Christ. The Jewish law was on the whole and from principle also binding for the heathen world. The ideas which were expressed in the preaching of Paul belonged to Old Testament and Jewish theology, and were therefore partly unintelligible to Greeks. Such, for example, as Christ, gospel, Spirit and flesh, sin and grace, law, righteousness of God, faith in the Pauline sense. The forms in which Paul expected the coming down of the kingdom of God from heaven upon earth and the coming of the Messiah, belong also to Jewish theology. Paul's doctrine of righteousness cannot deny its Jewish origin. The Christian idea of salvation in it is directly embraced in a Jewish scheme. True, he breaks this scheme and states the opposite of that, just what righteousness really means. The doctrine of God (Rom. 9-11) contains elements which conflicted with the philosophical thinking of an edu-

cated Greek and could only be explained from a residue of Jewish thinking. Paul could never wholly overcome his strong temperament which adhered to him as an inheritance of his people; indeed, it was a most wonderful fact that God chose a former Pharisee as his instrument to preach to the heathen; wonderful that such a world-historical success was assigned to this very Jew.

5. The life of Jesus stands before us in unity and closeness. It shows no rents, no cracks or breaks, no other course at different times. Jesus lived his life in continual, undisturbed communion with God. Paul, however, experienced in his life a deep change which affected the innermost part of his being. His theology is that of one who is broken. From his undisturbed communion with God Jesus perceived as none other did the weakness of human nature. Already at his baptism, in the beginning of his Messianic ministry, he entered into the sin of the people and by his baptism manifested that he considered the object of his calling to be the deliverance of the people from sin and guilt. He saw the hidden connection be-

tween sin and disease. He knew that the human race is evil; he taught his disciples to pray daily for the forgiveness of their guilt; he established in the Lord's Supper a continual memorial of the forgiveness of sins; took upon himself a cruel death to atone for his people, and yet he sketched no dark picture of the world. As in the Old Testament he finds God's will expressed in like perfection to that which he has in his heart, he regarded the world as God's creation in the light of perfection, which would be realized in it by the power that was in himself. He knew himself called to make the world anew, to make it what it was originally destined by God to be. He knew with absolute certainty that God's will intended this, and now already he saw the image of God shine forth even where present conditions suggested failure. Quietly and safely he described the ideal, unconcerned whether the distance from it were ever so great in the present reality.

Paul always bore in his body the marks of the struggle he passed through in his experience of Christ. In his conception and formulating of Christian salvation, we see clear-

ly in the apostle traces of the conversion of the Jew to Christianity. Jesus had no consciousness of difference in his attitude toward the Old Testament as God's revelation and the Old Testament law as the disposition of God's will, because everywhere in the Old Testament he found himself and his task pointed out and found the Word of God and the Will of God with his own communion with God, suitably also expressed in the Old Testament, even when he depreciated some Old Testament enactments. For Paul, even as a Christian, that also seems true. The Old Testament religion which met him as such in Pharisaism was abolished and laid aside for him through Christ; the Old Testament appeared to him as the ministration of death and condemnation; nevertheless, the Scripture stands for him immovable as the highest authority. A more certain proof than all arguments and loyal considerations is, for him, "It is written." With Scripture-proof every question is settled. In like manner the law is abolished for him through Christ—Christ is the end of the law as he is also the expression of the eternal, unchangeable will of God. From

this seeming contradictory position he did not swerve. Moreover, in consequence of the break experienced in his conversion, the apostle's conception of the world is thoroughly pessimistic. He sees the great distance from the goal before his eyes the world lies in a state of deepest sin and corruption. Not only heathenism but Judaism also, because of its wickedness, is under the wrath of God. Since Adam sin has had its sway in humanity; the law enhanced sin, yea, it was given that transgression might abound. Before and besides Christ there is no salvation. Only where Christ is operative with his power does he see God's seed grow upon earth. The necessary outcome of this conception of the world seemed to be asceticism and dualism; nevertheless the same liberty and the same idealism got also the upper hand in him which were in the character of Christ. It is Paul's conviction of faith also, that the world and all that is therein, is of God; that man can use everything which it offers with thanksgiving to God; that dietary laws and outward limitations, as Judaism established and which Jesus himself had not yet annulled, are opposed to the

creative will of God. What inner liberty is expressed in words like these: "Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God" (1 Cor. 10. 31). "For all things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours" (1 Cor. 3. 21, 22). And this liberty Christ gave to him.

6. The preaching of the earthly Jesus was essentially the preaching of the kingdom of God; but in the apostle's preaching, this idea plays no considerable part. The contents of his gospel is Christ. At the first glance this seems to be a contraction, but in reality it is only a concentration. Paul stated himself in 2 Cor. 1. 20 why he made Christ the center: "For all the promises of God in him are yea." Jesus himself also saw the realization of the kingdom of God united with his person. Where he was, there was the kingdom; for he had in himself the energies of the kingdom and planted them in humanity. His earthly teaching and educational activity had for its task the education of his disciples as instruments and coworkers of the kingdom. His ministry

of teaching revealed in him the divine powers of a Redeemer. It was only after the complete fulfillment of his Messianic work upon earth—which means, in the sense of Paul, only after his death on the cross and his resurrection—after Jesus had been exalted by God to heavenly power and glory, that he could manifest his Messianic power in its fullness. Thus the preaching of the kingdom is the veiling of the personal task of the work of Jesus; the preaching of the exalted Christ is the necessary unveiling of his central significance following the completion of his work. Hence in the putting aside of the original idea of the kingdom of God we have not a breaking away from the gospel but the certain knowledge that since the exaltation of Christ as Lord the kingdom of God is equivalent to service for Christ (Rom. 14. 17, 18). Christians know themselves translated by God into the kingdom of his dear Son (Col. 1. 13).

7. Paul's theology is redemption theology. In the center of his theological thought stands the cross of Christ. In his congregations he knew nothing except Jesus Christ the crucified. Here is the point where the

perfection and the supposed imperfection of the Pauline Christ-belief becomes most obvious. The Pauline Christ, in order to become a historical phenomenon, full of vigor, must be supplemented by the synoptic Son of man and the Johannean Son of God; for the object of our faith can be no less and no more than the whole Christ. We could not understand Christ, not subordinate to him as our Saviour and allow him to show us the way to our heavenly Father, unless in his preaching and in his work he won our hearts, and unless we heard God himself speaking to us in him. The *one* deed, his expiatory sacrifice on the cross, were too little. Now Paul himself, as we have shown, had the strongest impression of the personality and the divine conversation of Jesus, but in his preaching the life-picture of Jesus has not been brought out in such a way as our religious feeling demanded. In order to establish his gospel, Paul goes back to his own apostolic judgment or to the Old Testament even, where it was easier to refer to the historical work of Jesus. Nowhere in his Epistles did he sketch a portrait of Jesus or describe his lovely and

gracious manner, his grandeur and purity, the divine authorization of his doing, in concrete, historical events of his life. The description of the humble and obedient conduct of Jesus (Phil. 2. 7 sq.) would certainly read otherwise had it been given by one of his disciples who stood in earthly life-communion with Jesus. We would then, no doubt, read not only of his earthly appearance, "that he was obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." Paul also nowhere indicates that Jesus himself had first to learn what God had willed to break the impenitent mind of the people and to purge humanity; that only by looking back Jesus perceived which way to go was the decree of God.

The apostle puts the death of Jesus under different points of view; thus under that of the act of love for his own, of the obedience of calling of the covenant, but in the center of his contemplation of Jesus Christ the death stands as the atonement for humanity. It is indeed incorrect to state that he was the first to conceive the death of Jesus as an atonement. In pre-Pauline Christendom this understanding was already alive; for Paul

writes to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 15. 3): "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received; how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures," and before Peter, according to Gal. 2. 16, he asserted at Antioch the theological statement which Peter also recognized as correct: "we are justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law." This faith, however, also in the sense of Peter, has its foundation in nothing else than in the expiatory death of Christ. But in two words even of the synoptic tradition, Jesus himself, both times in allusion to the suffering servant of God (Isa. 53), represented his death and suffering as an atonement. "The Son of man came to minister, and to give up his life a ransom for many" (Matt. 20. 28); and in the words of the invitation of the Lord's Supper. But one cannot say that this understanding of the death of Jesus by the Synoptists surpassed the other interpretations. Jesus most frequently mentions his death as that of Son of man. In the quite predominant emphasis of the idea of atonement by Paul, there is no doubt a contraction. When a Pharisee, Paul took decisive offence

in the death of the Messiah on the cross, but this death afterward became the firm foundation of his doctrine of redemption and reconciliation.

And yet, the merit of Paul cannot be regarded too highly in that he distinctly regarded the death of Jesus as an atonement, for only thus is the character of Christianity securely established as the religion of redemption in the full sense. To be sure, Jesus is not only the Redeemer in his death, but also in his earthly work. But Jesus's death on the cross is and will remain the decisive judgment of God upon the sin of the world; and the crucified and risen Christ is the only and full assurance that we have a gracious God. Here the reasoning of Paul is one joined together in itself and is irrefutable from the standpoint of theism. If Christ died, he died according to the will of God. His death is therefore necessary for our salvation. If Christ died, he died not for his own sake, but for our sakes. Did Christ, the sinless Son of God, suffer death? Then this death is a divine judgment upon humanity. There is no salvation except in the appropriation of the saving power of this

death. If Christ, who died and rose again, made his divine power operative in his people, if he gave them of his Spirit, if he drew them into his life-communion, and makes us children of God who call "Abba, Father," then man cannot otherwise come to God than by leaving himself out of the question and taking everything from Christ's grace. Before God we stand as sinners, but he pardons us for Christ's sake, and by that which Christ gives us, we become acceptable in his eyes. Hence the Christian feels himself as a miracle of divine grace; all that he is, he is from God, through Christ his redeemer and friend.

This is also the powerful religious certainty which through the instrumentality of Paul has ever and ever beamed in the great men of the history of the Church. This is the Christian faith which Luther restored to us. It is a vain endeavor to represent Paul as the second founder of Christianity. Paul will remain what he was ordained to be, the apostle and servant of Christ. The contents of his preaching is the life-power and the power of redemption of the historical Christ.

CONCLUSION

The importance of Paul is, however, not exhausted in what he, as a disciple of Jesus who understood his Master, has been and still is within the history of the Christian religion; to him belongs also a place in the intellectual history of humanity.

The Greek world sought a knowledge of the cosmos. The world and its laws, its natural uniform causes, were the problems which it followed. Its ideal of life was an artificial additional building of the beauty and harmony of the universe in the ethico-historical world. According to Plato, the reason of man is conscious of its homogeneousness with the divine by plunging into this harmony of the cosmos and the pleasurable contemplation of its beauty. In such endeavor Greek philosophy, however, after a development of serious inquiry comprising some centuries, ended in skepticism, in the conclusion that proof of the reality of phenomena is impossible; that the knowledge of the objective basis of human knowledge is unattainable. This was a declaration of the bankruptcy of Greek philosophy. The

science of the human mind having arrived at this point, it could only be led along the way of a certain theory of knowledge, that is, if one distinguished the world outside us from the reality given in the inner life of man.

After the decay of the Greek city-states within which the individual had found a footing, practical results, respect, riches, personal satisfaction, individualism in philosophy had indeed come to a certain recognition in the Stoic and Epicurean systems; but for Greek science the knowledge remained hidden that in the self-consciousness of man a firm starting point is given from which man can comprehend himself in the world outside him. Socrates had already inquired into the criterion of the ideas of knowledge and moral consciousness, but he failed to discover that a powerful reality is given in conscious experience, the only one of which we are certain.

The first in whom experience and the metaphysical are met with in Paul. His self-consciousness felt perfectly sure of the facts of the inner religious life. In this conviction of the undeniable reality of the contents of the personal experience and in the geniality

of his personal sense of life, rests the surpassing greatness of the apostle over his time and the mighty influence he exerted, though his interest was confined to religion. Paul was no philosopher and never intended to be. He was not concerned about a theoretical definition of the world; but in his religious experience, and from this point, he transforms his views of God and the world. He gives no statement of religious experience proven in a knowably theoretical way, and yet he has a place in the historical progress of metaphysics as to the theory of knowledge. In him we find the beginnings of a psychological self-reflection and analysis of the events of the inner life which are the supposition for this, that the contents of the inner life are expressed in ideas. Augustine showed in bolder outlines all this which is met with in Paul in its first elements and in an undeveloped form, and on this account he denotes further progress in the knowledge of the meaning of reality given in self-consciousness. Augustine did not subject the facts of consciousness to a coherent construction of parts, and hence he failed to arrive at a contemplation of the

world which surpassed the limits of ancient philosophy. But he perceived the importance of Greek skepticism in ancient science and in a settlement with it found in Christian experience the point from which a new arrangement of the elements of a philosophy of the world must take place. In this manner he prepared the way for modern critical philosophy.

*Finis*

43938
225.97Q
F328E

Feine, Paul.

St. Paul as a Theologian.

225.97Q
F328E

43938